

THE
GRAVES--DITZLER:
OR,
GREAT CARROLLTON DEBATE,
ON
THE MODE OF BAPTISM, THE LORD'S SUPPER,
INFANT BAPTISM, BELIEVERS' BAPTISM,
CHURCH OF CHRIST, FINAL PERSEVERANCE OF SAINTS,
BETWEEN
J R. GRAVES, LL. D., and JACOB DITZLER, D. D.

Stereotyped by Southern Baptist Publication Society.

THIRD THOUSAND.

MEMPHIS, TENN.
PUBLISHED BY THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY.
1876

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1876, by
SOUTHERN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY.
In the office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

MEMPHIS, TENN., }
Feb. 15th, 1876. }

We, the parties to the Debate embraced in the present volume, hereby declare that we have read and corrected the whole work, which is now a faithful transcript of what we said in the discussion at Carrollton, Mo.

J. R. GRAVES.

J. DITZLER.

PUBLISHER'S INTRODUCTION

Oral debate is the pride and glory of our advanced civilization. This is admitted by all. It is a singular fact, therefore, that in this country, where the people boast of a free press and public discussion as the grandest trophies of liberty, there should still be some who have a deep-seated prejudice against religious controversy. It is confessed that there are great denominational issues upon which men are not agreed. These issues, all must know, are pregnant with mighty interests. We assume, therefore, that the earnest and prayerful discussion of denominational differences can but result in good. That our view is not singular, is manifest from the following quotations: "Some are disposed to deprecate all such discussions, * * * * * under the head of unprofitable controversy. That it is controversy, I admit; that it is *unprofitable* controversy, I deny. Dr. Wardlaw's Inf. Bap., page 1. The same distinguished author says, "Controversy is not a work from which any well constituted mind should shrink. If it be conducted in the spirit of the Master whom we serve, it is an important and indispensable means of eliciting truth." Ch. Lec. page 6.

Dr. J. Buchanan.—"Many sincere christians dislike controversy, and, so far from engaging in it themselves, can scarcely allow that others should. An enlarged view of the history of the christian church might serve to convince such persons. * * * That error, when it does appear, should be met by a bold exhibition of truth, seems to be one of the first duties the church owes to her divine head." Disc. on Nat. Rel. Est., pages 3, 4. "It is right that every one should express his deep and honest convictions in charity. Dr. J. Cumming." Sab. Eve. Rea. on Matt. III. Such are the views of calm and profound thinkers; views to which we call the attention of such as are averse to discussion, and hastily declare that it is not only productive of no good, but full of harmful influences.

Among the ancients, before the small or great assemblies, this was almost the only mode of investigation employed. The orator then performed much the same service for the people which the newspaper now does. Politics, philosophy and religion were all alike made the subject of discussion. The people rejoiced in the privileges of public debate. One

might think there was less need of debate now than in the past. Newspapers without number, and with the regularity of each bright morning, visit the homes of men. And there is no end to the production of books. But the truth is that, as the earth is filled with knowledge, through these and other instrumentalities, public speakers multiply, and there seems to be an enlarged and legitimate demand for public disputation. The increased light but serves to define more sharply the differences between men.

The guises of error disappearing before the light, its darkness and deformity are made manifest, while truth shines with its native and perfect splendor. These things true, there is a constant and inevitable tendency to discussion. And since it is scarcely possible, and to thinking men, not at all desirable to avoid it, we are made to wonder that persons can be found who are opposed to it. A law which interfered with the liberty of the secular press of our land, or which prevented the public discussion of great political issues, would arouse the hostility of the whole nation. The least abridgment of this political liberty would be regarded, even by those who stand opposed to the public discussion of theological questions, as the gravest national calamity. But heaven is higher than earth; and as it is impossible to measure the gap between these, there is no way to estimate the transcendent importance of religious as compared with political questions. The man, therefore, who favors the free discussion of secular questions, could not, it seems to us, with any considerable show of reason, oppose the discussion of matters infinitely more important.

And we venture the opinion that there is danger of periodical stagnation. War and much precious blood are the price paid for national greatness. Civilization reaches its highest development only after struggling up through the dust and darkness of battle. Repose brings along with it decay and ruin. It is much the same way in the religious world. An age of denominational repose is a period of decay. This is well illustrated in the history of the past. On the contrary, in the ages when the conflict between light and darkness has been the most severe, and when the sword and the ax have been freely employed, it was the boast of pious men that the very blood of the martyred saints was the seed of the church. The Great One has provided for constant agitation in the physical world. There is no rest throughout the realm of nature. And in addition to the universal activity of all the elements, we have great periodical convulsions. The God of nature needs the storm to purify the world. The onward march of Christianity, in the early centuries, was but the

progress of earnest and universal controversy. It was only when truth veiled her face, and retired from the conflict, that the dark ages, like a black and starless night, settled down on the whole earth. When she came forth again like the morning which wakes everything into life, she moved the nations with her power. Error was made forbidding by being contrasted with truth. But this was not all. A fierce and fearful war was made against every error and evil practice. And this struggle, this world-wide controversy of the Sixteenth Century resulted, as all confess, in a general *reformation*. We think, that in the period following our great revolution, the churches have been disposed to avoid a discussion of doctrinal differences. And those who shrink from the public discussion of truth, will be silent in the social circle; and becoming cowards, as they certainly will, they will not hesitate to surrender the strongholds of denominational power. In the conflict between truth and falsehood, pious men cannot afford to be silent. Aggression is a denominational necessity. Battle is the law of life. And nothing less than triumph can secure a church against the possibility of decay. The man who makes himself familiar with these facts, who feels the shock of the crashing thunderbolt or the tread of the storm, and who knows what blessings have sprung from the great discussions of the past, can hardly doubt that the present debate will be fruitful of much good.

If another reason is needed in support of public discussions and for the presentation of this volume, it may be found in the life and writings of the great Apostle to the Gentiles. Paul's whole life was but a single struggle. With his overwhelming logic, profound learning and great soul, he went right out into the front of the battle. He confronted the Jew with weapons drawn from the Bible, and contended grandly for the divinity of Christ; confounded the Ephesians with unanswerable arguments; overwhelmed the Athenians with his mighty logic; triumphed over the Corinthians in a profound and glorious argument on the resurrection; made the world, as well as individual monarchs, tremble with the weight of his splendid argumentation. He never threw aside the helmet or shield, and never laid down the sword. Panoplied in the armor of God, he was always girded and ready for the conflict—always in the battle. He went down at last in the strife, and gave up his life on the block. But as he surveyed his past life, he could truly say, "I have fought a good fight." Such was the life of Paul. And we conclude that the man who follows in the line of duty as illustrated in the life of this great teacher of religion will not greatly err. Such are our convictions in regard to the propriety of public discussions.

The reader will not think it a strange thing, with these facts before him, that we felt a deep and curious interest in the debate embodied in this book. The Baptist and Methodist denominations are almost wholly unlike each other in polity and doctrine. Their views in regard to the ordinances and certain doctrinal points are directly antagonistic. And the opposing practices and principles of the two denominations can but clash against each other. This necessary conflict found expression in a challenge by the M. E. church at Carrollton, to discuss certain questions and great cardinal doctrines about which the two denominations are not agreed. The Baptist church at Carrollton accepted the challenge. Dr. J. Ditzler, a learned and representative man, was chosen to conduct the debate on the part of the Methodists. Dr. Graves, whose reputation is not confined to a single continent, was selected to represent the Baptists. With such men as parties to the debate, and with a prospect of thoroughly discussing certain important points of doctrine and practice about which for centuries there had been a conflict of opinion in the great religious bodies of Europe and America, there was felt, as might have been expected, a very deep and general interest. It was the conviction of many that it would be second to no debate of the kind ever held on the continent. It was evident from the interest the press took in the matter, that the whole country was deeply concerned as to the result. It was claimed by both parties to this great conflict, that their chosen champions would be able to present the very best arguments in support of their peculiar views.

With all these facts before us, the Society felt justified in making arrangements to report, at great expense, the whole discussion. This we have done. And in order that there might be no doubt as to the fact that the authors are truly represented, we have paid Dr. Ditzler \$500.00 to correct the MSS. of our reporter, and read the proof as the work went through the press. Dr. Graves has done the same work free of charge. So the reader may be sure that, in the pages of this book, the speakers are fairly reported. And on the Mode of Baptism, Infant Baptism, the Church of Christ, Believer's Baptism and Final Perseverance, both parties have presented the best and clearest evidences of their faith.

We now submit the Great Debate to the reading public, in the hope that it may do good. We know that God can use it for His own glory. Should men be brought to the truth, and be made to love it and labor more for its advancement, then we shall be satisfied.

W. D. MAYFIELD,
Sec. S. B. P. Society.

ADDRESS
OF
COL. JOHN B. HALE.

AT ten o'clock, the meeting was called to order by Col. John B. Hale, the President, who, after prayer by the Rev. J. H. Pritchett, opened the proceedings with the following address:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—The preliminaries having been all satisfactorily arranged, the debate between the two distinguished Divines now present as representatives of the Methodist and Baptist denominations respectively, will be opened in a few minutes by Dr. Graves, who will maintain the affirmative of the first proposition, which reads as follows:

IMMERSION IN WATER IS THE ACT WHICH CHRIST COMMANDED
HIS APOSTLES TO PERFORM FOR CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

Dr. Graves' opening speech will be one hour long, and at its conclusion, Dr. Ditzler will follow on the opposite side in a speech of the same length. Certain rules of order have been adopted and will be strictly enforced by the Moderators, and among other things, all manifestations of approval or disapprobation on the part of the auditory, are strictly interdicted, and I am sure this prohibition will be religiously observed by the intelligent assemblies that this interesting occasion will bring together from time to time, during the progress of this discussion.

And I desire further to state, on the part of the Moderators, that in accepting a responsibility which they might have otherwise been reluctant to incur, they have only yielded to a sense of duty, and been influenced by a desire to facilitate and promote the success of a proceeding which they trust may contribute to the furtherance of the cause and interests of truth; a like sentiment they are persuaded, influences this large and intelligent audience, whose attendance here may be accepted

as an expression of their desire to learn, to know, and to practice the truth, thus furnishing a practical exemplification of one of the distinctive characteristics of a true Christian.

The rules of order will now be read to you by the Rev. J. H. Pritchett, of Fayette.

The disputants agree to adopt as "rules of decorum" those found in Hedges' Logic, p. 159, to-wit :

RULE 1. The terms in which the question in debate is expressed, and the point at issue, should be clearly defined, that there could be no misunderstanding respecting them.

RULE 2. The parties should mutually consider each other as standing on a footing of equality, in respect to the subject in debate. Each should regard the other as possessing equal talents, knowledge, and a desire for truth with himself; and that it is possible, therefore, that he may be in the wrong, and his adversary in the right.

RULE 3. All expressions which are unmeaning, or without effect in regard to the subject in debate, should be strictly avoided.

RULE 4. Personal reflections on an adversary should, in no instance, be indulged.

RULE 5. The consequences of any doctrine are not to be charged on him who maintains it, unless he expressly avows them.

RULE 6. As truth, and not victory, is the professed object of controversy, whatever proofs may be advanced, on either side, should be examined with fairness and candor; and any attempt to answer an adversary by acts of sophistry, or to lessen the force of his reasoning by wit, caviling or ridicule, is a violation of the rules of honorable controversy.

[Signed] J. R. GRAVES.
J. DITZLER.

The rules of order having been read, Col. Hale proceeded: It may be proper for me to say that by the mutual agreement of the disputants, the opening statements, on either side, will be *read*.

Now, if in acting out a new and unaccustomed *role*, I should betray any nervous trepidation, you will make for me the apology pleaded by the young preacher in like circumstances: *I am not used to it*—custom and habit have not yet inured me to so severe a test on my modesty

THE
GREAT CARROLLTON DEBATE.

FIRST PROPOSITION:

IMMERSION IN WATER IS THE ACT WHICH CHRIST COMMANDED
HIS APOSTLES TO PERFORM FOR CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

DR. GRAVES Affirms.
DR. DITZLER Denies.

FIRST DAY—Monday, 10 o'clock.

[DR. GRAVES' OPENING SPEECH.]

MR. PRESIDENT:—I must be permitted to say that I heartily appreciate the distinguished honor put upon me by my friends here in Carrollton, by selecting me as their mouthpiece and representative on this occasion. Challenged as they were by the respectable denomination of Methodists in this place, to discuss some of the chief questions at issue between that body and themselves, their conduct, had they declined the contest, might have been interpreted as a confession of weakness or as indifference to the interests of truth, and have subjected them to the imputation of pusillanimity. These considerations, moreover, were enhanced by the fact that it was generally understood that the act of the local body, here at Carrollton, had the sanction of the denomination at large in the State of Missouri, as well as of the Methodist Bishops South. When selected, therefore, to maintain, as their representative, the principles dear alike to them and me as being an integral part of the gospel of Christ, and to discuss them with a represen-

tative man like my friend, Elder Ditzler, who, by his learning and ability, is pre-eminently qualified to make the best defence which the errors he champions are susceptible of, I promptly accepted the gage of conflict.

I am grateful for the distinguished privilege of standing up in the midst of this intelligent community, and in the very heart of this great State and of the Great West, to renew the conflict that was commenced, not 300, but 1575 years ago, when my denominational ancestors with the gloom of the dungeon, the flames of martyrdom and the terrors of expatriation threatening, protested against the changes and innovations that ambitious and impious prelates and heresiarchs were then commencing to foist into the practice and observance of the church. I but renew here, this day, the conflict of the ages—I but re-utter the testimony of all the holy martyrs, by reaffirming, as I do, that

1. All that Christ has required of the people to believe for salvation, and all that he has enjoined upon them to observe for obedience, he has taught so plainly in his word that the common people, without the assistance of priest or rabbi, can understand without a doubt, and may obey without a hesitation. And that other axiom,

2. Whatever Christ has appointed, man may not change in the least by substitution, adding to or taking from, without imperiling his soul's salvation. Revelations xxii. 18, 19:

“For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book; and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.”

Finally, Mr. President, I am gratified in being permitted to meet so reputable a man and scholar as Mr. Ditzler, a gentleman who stands forth as pre-eminently the ablest public defender of the principles and practices of American Methodism. If he is unable to defend its claims to Scriptural authority for its doctrines and practices beyond all doubt, then the most sanguine Methodist ought not to believe that it can be done by mortal man, nor do I believe it can; and surely if

he cannot successfully overthrow the positions of Baptists, which he has so confidently undertaken to do in this discussion, then Methodists and the world have a right to conclude that no living man can overthrow them. But should I fail, in this conflict, my brethren know there are scores of abler leaders, who have borne our banner with honor upon the high places of the field, standing ready to seize it should it be stricken from my feeble hand ere one, as yet, unsullied fold of it shall trail the dust.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, my opponent and myself have not met here as mere combatants, bared ecclesiastical gladiators, to engage in a trial of personal prowess before you. The questions to be settled are not, which of the two is the superior in mental acumen or scholarly qualifications, or which is the more dexterous in polemical "thrust and fence;" but one of infinitely higher moment calls us all together, and one that affects our eternal well-being, viz: what does Christ, in his word, require us to do in order to obey him, and thus meet his "well done, good and faithful servants?" A consideration like this should be sufficient to cause you to forget the persons and reputations of your representatives, and all denominational and partisan considerations, and bend every power of your mind to the one inquiry, "what is the truth?" determined to accept it wherever it may lead you. I know the motive that inspires me upon this occasion, and the Eye that is looking into my inmost heart, and that to Him, and not to this congregation, must I look for my enduring praise. I shall endeavor to conduct this debate on my part in the spirit of an earnest Christian, and of fidelity to Christ. I shall do all in my power to unsting this controversy—to speak the truth in love, and in the love of it—and in the noble strife of solid facts and sound reasoning, it will be my ambition to come off victorious. The prayer of my heart is, that if I am in error upon any of these questions, I may be enlightened and converted to the truth, and that my opponent, in error, as I now think he is, and multitudes of his brethren, may be led by the Holy Spirit into the truth, through the influence of this discussion.

Reading a speech in a recently published debate, my eye fell upon this statement by one of the disputants:

"I may announce to the audience that we shall spend to-day and half of to-morrow, if not more, before any ordinary hearer or reader will understand anything about what we are saying." *Wilkes and Ditzler Debate*, p. 411.

And that published debate is before the public, and I have no conviction that a half dozen ordinary readers ever will understand anything about what they said, and consequently, cannot be benefitted by it. Now, I am free to say here, that such a discussion and such a book it is not my intention to have any voice or hand in making, for there is no place for it. Scholars certainly do not want such books, nor do they read them; and the common readers cannot understand them; and what purpose under heaven do they serve but as a stage upon which to display the classical lore of the disputants—or lack of it—to excite the wonder of partisan crowds that are wholly unable to judge of the merit of it? The world never did need such a discussion, it certainly does not need it now. If I speak, not for *one day*, but for *one minute*, in this discussion, so that the ordinary hearer, or the intelligent youth of sixteen, does not understand me, I shall feel that I owe him an apology for imposing upon him, and should ask forgiveness of Him who called me by his grace to teach the people. But what profit if I speak in an *unknown* tongue, or above their comprehension? Let this explain why I shall, throughout, adhere so closely to the text of God's word, and to the literal and obvious construction and meaning of it, rather than to display my acquaintance with a few words in many foreign tongues to appear learned in your eye. It is with the *word* of God we have to do, and it is with the word, as given us by the Holy Spirit in the Greek language, we have to do. Grant the Savior may have spoken in Hebrew, or Syriac, or Chinese, it matters not to us, nor does it, in the least, affect the language of his commands or help us to understand them.

The Holy Spirit knew what Christ said, and chose the language in which to communicate his sayings to the world, infallibly guided the evangelists, not only as to what they should say, but selected the very words in which they should

say it. It is, as you can all see, with *their words in the language in which they wrote, that we have to do*, and not with any other language, only incidentally; to make other languages, therefore, prominent in this discussion, must be accounted in very bad taste as well as unscholarly, for a true scholar uses the classics as God does miracles, never unnecessarily.

In justice to myself I feel that an explanation is due to the public for the very imperfect preparation I have made for this discussion. The few weeks I had allotted to it have been spent in bed, delirious with fever; or in the sick-room, too enfeebled to think, or under the influence of medicine; and much that I have written has been done when I was alternating between arctic rigors and worse than tropical heats, and the congestion that has generally attended these attacks in our State, falling upon the lungs or brain and often terminating fatally, fell upon my larynx, seriously affecting my voice, nor has it, for a month past, yielded to the most effective remedies; and, unless the prayers of my brethren prevail with Him who can overrule all things, I have no reason to believe that, reduced as I am physically, I can long endure the unusual demands this debate will make upon both voice and strength. But touching this question.

We have met here to-day to discuss this proposition, viz:

Immersion is the Act which Christ Commanded for Baptism.

That it is important for us to know the specific duty Christ commanded us to do, no one will deny. It is as important as it is to obey Christ. To do something different through ignorance, willful or willing, involves the soul in sin and positive transgression, and manifests a spirit in rebellion to Christ. To say that none but the most learned, and only a very small minority of them, have, after 1875 years, discovered the true meaning of Christ when he issued the command, is to impugn his wisdom, yea, to blaspheme his character as a law-giver. Unless Christ and his inspired apostles did use a word clearly and specifically indicating the act, that every man, and woman, and responsible child of the Greek-speaking nations could understand without the assistance of a scholar, then the command was not addressed to them, or binding upon them,

and a failure to obey it could have been no sin. Unless Christ and his apostles used a term, the import of which could be easily, clearly, and undoubtedly understood by the scholars of all nations, so as to enable them to make correct versions of the Scriptures into all tongues, then the Scriptures were not designed for any other people than the Greeks and Jews.

Now, it is admitted that Christ in instituting Christian Baptism selected from the copious language of the Greeks, that, unlike our own or any other known tongue, has not only a word for every idea, but for the slightest distinctions and nicest shades of ideas—I say it is admitted that Christ, out of such a language, selected but *one* word to denote the act that he commanded to be performed, and the evangelists and apostles never used but one simple word, and that word is *baptidzo*. And this is the only word we have to do with in discussing this proposition. As this act is, like repentance, enjoined and binding upon all, every accountable being however young, can as easily understand it—taken in connection with the examples given—without a scholar's assistance as he can the prior duties of repentance toward God and faith in Christ, and the man or angel that teaches otherwise destroys man's faith in the Bible, as well as man's own individuality in religion.

I here affirm, fearless of successful contradiction, that the term, *baptidzo* is as easily defined as any other simple verb in the Greek language—as the verb *edoo*, to eat, *pinoo*, to drink or *pneoo*, to breathe the vital air.

Mr. President, this discussion is a reflection upon Christ, or upon Christian scholars; it is a reproach to the law-giver, or to those who say his law is couched in terms that cannot be undoubtedly understood by even the best scholars of earth; so obscure and ambiguous that Christ's disciples are driven into differences of opinion, and consequently into sects and divisions. As a friend of Christ and Christianity, I lift up my voice to-day for Christ. He is not responsible for any misunderstanding among scholars and ministers, for these have originated the divisions and misunderstandings among the common people. No man ever spake like Him, and no law-

giver ever used terms so simple, or so easy to be understood by the common people, as the Law-giver of Nazareth. To say that the unlettered millions of those who used the Greek language in the days of Christ and his apostles, did not understand the specific act Christ commanded, when he or his apostles used the term *baptidzo*, is either to release them from obeying it on the one hand, or to establish the iniquitous dogma of the Romish apostasy on the other—*i. e.*, that it was not designed for the common people to read the word of God and interpret it for themselves—the priest alone is to read such portions as he deems proper, and to interpret them to the people; and more, that even the priest must have the inspiration of heaven to ascertain the meaning of the simplest passages of Scripture—so occult their meaning!

But it is to speak against Christ, to release them from obeying Christ; and it is rejecting Christ as an authoritative teacher and law-giver, to turn the people over into the hands of scholars, priests, and ministers to learn what to believe or what to do to obey him. The inspired Scriptures are to us everything or nothing. If the faith that unites us to Christ, and the act in and by which we profess that faith, cannot be undoubtedly understood by the common millions, who understood the Greek language, and by all the common unlettered millions of earth, from faithful versions of the Greek, then the Scriptures were not intended for man, and the race of Adam is under no obligation to believe or to be baptized. Who will openly say this? Therefore if I—if an inspired apostle—“if an angel from heaven” should stand here and tell you that this Word cannot be understood, even by all scholars, or that it has a different signification when used by Christ and his apostles than when used by Josephus or any other author, Greek or Jew, who wrote in Greek, living in the *same century with Christ and his apostles*, let him be rejected by you as a false teacher and deceiver.

The reproach of this discussion to-day, and of every other discussion upon this word since man changed the action of baptism, rests, not upon the blessed Savior, but upon men, and they not the professed enemies, but the professed friends of

Christ: and shall I say it, the professed ministers of Christ?

And let me say a word in defence of the true and standard scholars of all ages, as a class, and for your sakes who hear me, to disabuse your minds at the outstart of a deep-seated misimpression. The strife among them for more than fifteen centuries, to their credit be it spoken, was not as to the signification of *baptidzo*, but it was, first, whether the church had not the right, in extreme cases, to substitute a copious overpouring, (*perfundere*) and, ages after, even a sprinkling, (*rantidzo*) of the water upon the infant, or the subject, to save its soul from death, and then, in any and all cases, as a matter of taste or convenience. It has been but little over two hundred years since the question has been put into its present form by a class of men—and a very small class of men, and they not the recognized and standard scholars of colleges and universities of earth, but the recognized polemics and professional controversialists of their respective sects, who generally treat with a sovereign contempt the learning of the ancients, and the most renowned scholarship of the universities of both hemispheres, and even the opinions of *the fathers and founders of their own sects*—by men, I say, who will put their own unqualified assertions in opposition to the unanimous verdict of the scholarship of all ages, as well as to the plain teachings of the word of God. To this complexion hath the controversy come at last in these corrupt times.

There never was any dispute in the world for fifteen centuries as to the primary meaning of *baptidzo*, or the practice of the apostles or apostolic churches; there was none among the Greeks who spoke the language Christ and the evangelists used, and who have, from the fourth century, immersed, and have, to-day, no communion with the Latin Catholic church, because it has changed the original act. The Greek church calls the Latin “sprinkled, and not baptized Christians.” Who can question that the Greeks understood the simplest term in their own language? There never was any disagreement among the Greek fathers, nor among the Latin fathers, nor the historians or scholars of the Catholic church from the rise of that church in the seventh century until this day.

There is not a Catholic prelate or priest upon this or any soil, who will for a moment deny that *baptidzo* literally means to immerse, or will deny that immersion was the universal practice of the apostles and of the church generally for thirteen hundred years. They are frank to admit that the original act has been changed by the authority of the church. I challenge the advocate of sprinkling to produce a scholar, lexicographer or historian, belonging to the Greek or Latin Catholic churches, who ever claimed that sprinkling and pouring are literal, proper meanings of the term *baptidzo*, or that either act was the *practice* of their respective churches for thirteen centuries, except in extreme cases, danger of death. This statement cannot be denied by any honest scholar. The reproach of this discussion rests, not upon the Greek or Latin Catholic communions, but, I say it with shame, upon a class of *modern* Protestant controversialists.

CALVIN, the father and founder of Presbyterianism, and doubtless the ripest scholar of his age, as he is universally admitted to be the profoundest theologian, admitted that *baptidzo* means to immerse, and that this was the practice of the primitive churches. But still he practiced sprinkling or aspersion. And this is the way in which he vindicated his consistency in maintaining a practice in direct conflict with the teachings of God's word. He claimed that it was quite possible to retain the *essence* of the rite while departing somewhat from the prescribed *form*, and that the essence of baptism was retained by him and his people, though they had made aspersion to supersede immersion.

The essence! and what is the essence? Who can give us any assurance that we have retained the essence of an ordinance when we deliberately depart from the mode prescribed by the law-giver? God commanded Noah to build an ark of Gopher wood, and suppose he had substituted white pine for Gopher wood, would this deviation from the divine command have retained the "essence" of it? If Noah had thus exercised his own discretion in a matter where none had been given him, would God have accepted the act as having in it the essence of obedience? The very supposition is preposterous, not to say impious.

LUTHER freely admitted that *baptidzo* means to immerse, and that the design of baptism seemed to require it as well as personal faith on the part of the subject. And, to the credit of Protestantism, the overwhelming mass of her scholars, commentators and theologians, the priests and professors of her colleges and universities, and the hosts of her linguists, her lexicographers and historians, all admit and declare that *baptidzo* means to immerse, and that immersion was undoubtedly the practice of the primitive churches; and the only exception is a small, and thank God! a very small, class of modern controversialists who take the opposite position, and by this class, controversies like this originate.

President Robinson, of Brown University, in a recent printed address:

"I suppose it to be admitted, Mr. President, by all real scholars, that biblical learning, and the higher biblical criticism, is altogether on our side. It is, perhaps, needless in this presence to say that the two, if not the three, foremost biblical scholars in this country are Baptists. I suppose it to be admitted by all real biblical scholars, of both Europe and America, that our mode of baptism was the primitive one. I suppose it to be admitted by all competent and candid scholars, European and American, that there was no infant baptism in the primitive church; that the first Christians received baptism only on profession of personal faith in Christ; that there are no traces of either Episcopacy or Papacy in the New Testament. These I take to be the facts in the case. They are not disputed by impartial scholars. We can summon for our support, therefore, the biblical learning of the world."

Were these statements not defensible, so eminent a scholar, and so little a Baptist withal, would not have pronounced them in the ear of the world.

In support of what I have said, I read three statements, one from a Baptist, one from a Lutheran, and one from a Presbyterian — most eminent men.

1. President Robinson: "That the symbolism of baptism is opposed to the idea of sprinkling and pouring, or any other act than immersion."

2. Bretschneider: "Baptize is the symbolical rite by which, according to the injunction (command) of Christ, consecration of Christianity is accomplished by the dipping of the person to be baptized into water, by means of which not only he becomes entitled to all the privileges, but also takes on himself all the liabilities of the Christian."

3. Dr. Geo. Campbell, Presbyterian, President of Marischal College, Scotland, 1796: "I have heard a disputant, in defiance of etymology and

use, maintain that the word rendered in the New Testament *baptize*, means more properly to sprinkle than to plunge, and in defiance of all antiquity, that the former was the earliest and the most general practice in baptizing! One who argues in this manner, never fails with persons of knowledge, to betray the cause he would defend; though with respect to the vulgar, bold assertions generally succeed as well as argument, and sometimes better; yet a candid mind will always disdain to take the help of falsehood, even in the support of the truth." *Lec. X. on Pulpit Elo., p. 302.*

Remember Dr. C. was a *Presbyterian*.

In supporting my proposition, I shall but establish the truth of these statements. I do not in the least indicate that my opponent will lay himself open to the rebuke of Dr. Geo. Campbell—he *need* not do it, but should he see fit to do so, I shall not seek to abate, but shall certainly think him deserving of the verdict Dr. Campbell so forcibly and justly pronounces upon so reckless a disputant.

At the outstart of this discussion, I think it best to submit the leading rules of biblical interpretation, selected from standard sources, that must govern our investigations and interpretations of divine truth. I have selected them from Stuart, Morus, Ernesti, Horne, and Blackstone, to none of which will my opponent object; if so, he can file his objection:

RULES OF INTERPRETATION.

I. *Every word must have some specific idea or notion, which we call meaning.* Were not this so, words would be meaningless and useless.

II. The *literal*, which is also called the *grammatical sense* of a word, is *the sense* so connected with it that it is first in order, and is spontaneously presented to the mind as soon as the sound is heard. This meaning is always (save in one lexicon, *i. e., Stokius'*) placed first in the lexicons, and is known as *the primary meaning*.

III. "The primary or literal meaning is *the only true one*." *Ernesti, p. 14.*

Ernesti quotes Morus in support of this:

"There can be no certainty at all in respect to the interpretation of any passage, unless a kind of necessity compels us to affix a particular sense to a word; which sense, as I have before said, must be *one*; and unless there are special reasons for a *tropical* (or secondary) meaning, it must be the literal sense."

Moses Stuart says:

"If any one should deny that the above principles lead to certainty

when strictly observed, he would deny the possibility of finding the meaning of language with certainty."

Blackstone says:

"To interpret a law, we must inquire after the *will* of the *maker*, which may be collected either from the words, the context, the subject-matter, the effects and consequences, or spirit and reason of the law. (1) Words are generally to be understood in their usual and most knowing signification; not so much regarding the propriety of grammar as their general and popular use. * * (2) If words happen still to be dubious, we may establish their meaning from the context, etc. Of the same nature and *use* is the comparison of law *with laws* that are made by the *same* legislator, that *have some affinity with the subject*, or that EXPRESSLY RELATE TO THE SAME POINT." *Blackstone's Com., Vol. I, pp. 59-61.*

IV We are not at liberty to fix an arbitrary sense to a word, nor can the meaning of a word be diverse or *multifarious* at the same time and in the same passage, (*i. e.*, the same word cannot mean to sprinkle and to pour upon or to dip into, since they are different acts.)

Stuart remarks on this rule:

(a) "The fact that usage has attached *any particular meaning* to a word, like any other historical fact, is to be proved by adequate testimony. This testimony may be drawn from books in which the word is employed, (this is the *usus loquendi*). But the fact of a particular meaning being attached to a word when once established, can no more be changed or denied than any historical fact whatever.

(b) "All men, in their daily conversation and writings, attach but *one sense* to a word, at the same time and in the same passage, unless they design to speak in enigmas. Of course it would be in opposition to the universal custom of language, if *more than one* meaning should be attached to any word of Scripture in such a case."

V To attempt to gather the sense of words from things rather than what we ought to think of things from the words of the Holy Spirit, is deceptive and fallacious.

Ernesti quotes Melancthon as saying:

"The Scripture cannot be understood theologically until it is understood *grammatically*."

Luther also says:

"A certain knowledge of the sense of Scripture depends solely on a knowledge of words."

I call special attention to the following most important, but generally overlooked or unreceived, law of interpretation:

VI. The principles of interpretation are common to sacred and ordinary writings, and the Scriptures are to be investigated by the same rules as other books.

Stuart adds this forcible remark:

"The Bible was made for man, and in the language of men, and must

be translated by the rules that govern human language or they are of no use to the race."

The last question we settle, touching the correct principles of interpretation is, how the meaning of a word can be ascertained.

VII. The meaning of any word in the New Testament is to be determined by the *usus loquendi*.

1. By the *usus loquendi* is meant the sense which usage attaches to the words of any language. We obtain direct testimony as to the *usus loquendi*, Says Ernesti:

"1. From the writers to whom the language investigated was *vernacular*, or from their cotemporaries.

"2. From those who, though foreigners, had learned the language in question.

"3. From scholiasts, glossographies and versions made while the language was spoken, and by those who were acquainted with it.

"4. By the comparison of parallel passages."

Dr. Horne gives us a few simple rules:

1. *The meaning* of a word used by any *writer* is the meaning affixed to it *by those for whom he immediately wrote*.

2. The received (or most obvious) signification of a word is to be in all cases retained unless weighty and necessary reasons require that it should be abandoned.

3. In no case may we select a meaning repugnant to natural reason.

The correctness of these rules, my opponent will not question—no man can question—and their application to the interpretation of God's word will forever, without the least difficulty, settle the meaning of *baptidzo*, and that of every other word connected with this discussion; and so easy are they to be understood and applied, that a child in years, if only accountable, can understand and apply them.—[*Time out.*]

DR. DITZLER'S
FIRST REPLY

MR. PRESIDENT:—With profound gratitude to God for his preserving care and redeeming mercy, we appear before you to-day to present our defense of what we believe to be the truth of God. It is with pleasure and satisfaction that we have one so experienced in Christian polemics, matured in judgement, ripe in scholarship, skillful in debate as J. R. Graves, LL. D.

From my extensive tours, of late years, in Tennessee, Alabama, Missouri and Texas, and in Southern Kentucky, I learned that no man on the Continent commanded the influence among Baptists that Dr. Graves now commands. It is, therefore, with propriety that the Baptist papers speak as does the *Western Baptist*, when it says:

“Dr. Graves has a reputation, honestly and fully deserved, that is world-wide. We doubt not, if it was left to the Baptists of the South and West, in such a discussion as the present one, he would be the first choice, by unanimous consent. His great familiarity with the points at issue, his wonderful powers of analysis, his rhetorical skill, his readiness and brilliant repartee, make him a foe to be dreaded before the masses. In a word, he is everything that could be desired for the work before him.”

He evidently pities me, and says:

“We rejoice that Mr. Ditzler has consented to become the scape-goat for the Methodists of Carrollton.”

In such a discussion as this, it is fully expected that those fundamental principles in philology that lie at the foundation of this question, read by Dr. Graves, and on which all immersionist writers of note agree, the question turns—by them settled—will be fully, scientifically and, therefore, satisfactorily settled. Hence, so much do scholars realize this, that Dr. Conant has only 16 1-2 lines of English quotations from the

Bible. 16 1-2 lines from James' version, in his whole book on baptism, if I was correct in my careful count, and A. Campbell, 10 1-2. These are fair examples.

The rules of exegesis, read to you by the Doctor, we cordially accept in their connection and intent, so far as Ernesti, Stuart and Blackstone were cited.

MODE OR ACTION OF BAPTISM.

The first thing in order now is, a definition of the terms so often to be used, and often accommodatingly, during this discussion.

DIP.—To dip, in the sense we aim to discuss here, is to put an object in or into an element (water) and immediately withdraw it. To such an act, we apply the word dip. (See Webster.) It was the word always used by the Baptists till comparatively recent times. It is very different from immerse.

IMMERSE.—Immerse is an Anglicized Latin word, eminently classic, compounded of *in*, spelled *im* for euphony, and *mergo* to sink. Hence, the English of immerse is to sink in. Whenever you put an object into or under a liquid, it is immersed while it remains in the element. The moment it is withdrawn, it is not immersed.

In fully three-fourths of the terms in regular use, where dip is used, it is a partial, not complete, though momentary entrance into the liquid. I am said to dip my finger into a drop of liquid, my pen in ink, a piece of bread in sop. There is no envelopment in such cases, and only momentary contact.

AUTHORITIES.

The authorities usually appealed to are (1) the expressions used in James' version, which is a reprint of Tyndale's, 1626, so far as the New Testament expressions and use of baptize go. As Dr. Graves proves, introduction to M. Stuart On Baptism, page 24, that immersion was the practice in England, long after this, even till the 17th century, when aspersion gradually came in; and A. Campbell, Christian Baptism 140, proves that James' translators would not on any "occasion favor the innovation of sprinkling by any rendering or

note marginal in that translation," we are perfectly willing to appeal the case to the highest courts of judicature known in the republic of letters.

By consent and practice of all parties, our leading sources of information here, are,

1. The Lexicons.
2. The Original Languages, in which now comparative philology must be introduced.
3. The Ancient Versions, made by the most competent authorities, and so sustained and preserved through all time since.

The first and most popular appeal is to the Greek Lexicons that define the verb *baptidzo*, *i. e.*, baptize. Over all the land, for years past, the language I find in last week's paper (*The Baptist*), and *verbatim* the same in the tract sent out by the Central Baptist Company, St Louis, Mo., page 17, has been in substance reflected, until it is a song :

"Thirty-two Greek lexicons define *baptidzo*, to dip, plunge, or immerse, and not one of them defines it to pour or to sprinkle."

We charge not those good men with willful wrong here. We believe they never saw the great body of the works elsewhere by them quoted or named. But we look for a better course hereafter.

Are our immersion friends willing to be governed by the lexicons? Will they abide their authority? Some lexicons are written solely to explain classic Greek, where *baptizo* applies to overwhelming with debts, taxes, burdens; to intoxicate, overwhelming and sinking ships, drowning, overflowing, inundating, etc., *i. e.*, to abusing, aspersing, pouring abuse upon people, but never in the New Testament is it so used. In classics it is never used in any religious or ceremonial sense.

They at times, though rarely, tell us such and such word is used in the New Testament in such and such sense, also marking the distinction of its use and meaning in classic and New Testament Greek.

On the contrary many lexicons are published solely to define New Testament Greek. These vary in different schools.

One, as Wahl, will explain the New Testament words, at times, from New Testament stand-points, at others, wholly from the classic stand-point, while Stokius mixes badly and perplexes often, and is seemingly contradictory of himself. Others, the great body of them, give the classic meanings, then the New Testament meaning elaborately. We shall quote the great body of the best lexicons of all schools and all ages known.

To save time, then, we freely grant you, that when giving the classic meanings, all lexicons give either immerse, sink (its English), dip, plunge, overwhelm, often all, as among the classic meanings, and a very few, as Bretschneider, Wahl, etc., give one or more of these as among the New Testament meanings. We make this statement to do justice to all sides. Besides, our opponent will fully present that side. The only question with our opponent being: Do they give sprinkle or pour? That is the point at issue now.

I will give four authorities, first, who did not write lexicons, or a *Clavis, Critica Sacra*, etc., but who spoke from the stand-point of lexicography, defining and rendering the word. We quote them, because they are earlier than any lexicon we have defining *baptidzo*, Hesychius and Suidas, *i. e.*, natives, of the 4th and 10th centuries, only defining partially the root *bapto*.

1. Tertullian, A. D., 190, defines *baptizo* to sprinkle (*perfundere*). *De Anima*, c. 51.

2. Julianus, 4th century, a most learned critic, defines it sprinkle (*perfundere*). Beza's Annot. Matt. iii.

3. Augustine, the illustrious theologian of that age, sanctions this, as to its religious import. See Beza's Annot. Matt. iii. 6, 11, folio.

4. Euthymius, a learned Greek father, 4th century, renders *baptizo* to sprinkle, (*rantidzo*). Alford, on Mark vii. 4.

5. Schwarzius, to sprinkle, to besprinkle, to pour upon. Ingham (Baptist) *Hand-book on Baptism*, p. 40, and in Booth's *Pedobaptist*, in *Baptist Library*, p. 351-2.

6. Grimshaw, (copied) "besprinkle."

7 Ed. Robinson, "the more general idea of ablution or affusion."

8. Kouma, native Greek, besprinkle, shed forth.

9. Wahl, edition of 1831, to sprinkle (*perfundo*).

10. Parkhurst, 111, effusion, copying Stokius.

11. Liddell & Scott, 1st edition, steep, wet, pour upon.

12. Suicer, by immersion or sprinkling (*per immersionem aut aspersionem*).

13. Schneider, *wie brecho* (as that word in meaning), shed forth, sprinkle, wet.

14. Sophocles, ablution, bathed (baptized) in tears.

15. Ed. Leigh, to sprinkle (*adspergere*).

16. Wolfius, sprinkle (*aspersione*).

17. Walaëus, indifferently sprinkling, or immersion (*aspersione an immersione*). Leigh's Crit. Sac.

18. Vossius, iii. (*adspergere*) to sprinkle.

19. Arst, perfusion (*perfusionem*).

20. Schaetgenius, to pour forth (*profundo*).

21. Ewing, pour abundantly upon, *i. e.*, infuse. Ingham, p. 39. Elder Wilkes, Louisville Debate, 511, reports him overwhelmed by pouring upon, drench or impregnate with liquor by affusion.

22. Gazes, learned native Greek, shed forth anything, water, pour upon (*epichuno*), *epi*, upon; and *cheo*, pour.

23. Stokius. As the three following lexicons are so important, and so generally garbled, we will read their definitions in full, the more as Stokius and Schleusner are of the class that believed that wash, sprinkle, etc., were meanings derived from the idea of dipping or immersing.

Stokius, "*baptidzo, lavo, baptizo, passivum baptidzomai, luor, lutor*—I wash, (wash, wet, besprinkle), I baptize, passive voice, I am washed." He then gives its classic, or general meaning, as he understood it, in the usual note he appends to most words, where he analyzes it from the unscientific and false stand-point of that day, refuted by both sides now. "Generally, and by the force of the word, it obtains the sense of dip-

ping or immersing. Specially (a) properly it is to immerse or dip in water. (b) *Tropically*, (1) by a *metalepsis*, it is to wash (*lavare*), or cleanse (*abluere*), because anything is accustomed to be dipped or immersed in water, that it may be washed or cleansed, (*ut lavetur, vel abluatur, quamquam et adspargendo aquam, lotio vel ablutio fieri queat et soleat*, Mark vii. 4; Luke xi. 38. *Hinc transferetur ad baptismi sacramentum, etc.*

Per Met. designat (a) miranulosam Spiritus S. [sancti] effusionem super apostolos, aliosque credentes, tum ob donorum Spiritus S., copiam, prout olim aqua baptizandis copiose affundebatur, vel illi penitus in aquam immergebantur, etc.) Note well this author,—"that it may be washed or cleansed, *although also, the washing or cleansing can be, and* GENERALLY IS, accomplished BY SPRINKLING THE WATER, Mark vii. 4, Luke xi. 38. *Hence*, it is transferred to the sacrament of baptism." Here Stokius, always heralded as the prince of immersion lexicons, tells us that the washing of *baptidzo* was *generally (soleat fieri)* accomplished (*adspargendo*) by *sprinkling* the water, and cites the gospels of Mark and Luke as his proofs;—in view of *that* fact, the term is "applied to the sacrament of baptism," and quotes a number of texts on *that* point. But he does not stop there. "3. Metaphorically, it designates (a) the miraculous *pouring out (effusionem)* of the Holy Spirit upon the apostles and other believers, as well on account of the abundance of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, since anciently the water was copiously poured upon those baptized, or they were immersed deep in the water, etc." Here Stokius declares that because the water was copiously poured on those baptized, hence the New Testament writers apply *baptidzo* to the miraculous pouring out of the Spirit.

24. Schleusner has been claimed as a great witness for exclusive immersion. I hold him as well as Stokius in my hand. He is a great standard. "Properly: I immerse or dip, I plunge into water, from *bapto*, and answers to (*i. e., translates*) *tabhal*, 2 Kings v. 14, in the Alexandrian version, and *tabha* in [the version of] Symmachus, Ps. 68, 5. and in an uncertain one [*i. e., who translated it,*] Ps. ix. 6. But in *this* sense it never occurs in the New Testament, but very frequently [it

does] in Greek writers [*i. e., classics*], for example, Diodorus Siculus i. 36, of the overflowing of the Nile (*de Nilo exundante*), etc." "Strabo, Polybius, etc." Like Stokius, he now derives wash, cleanse, from the idea of dipping in water that an object may be washed, "hence, 2. *abluo, lavo, aqua purgo*"—I cleanse, I wash, I purify with water. Thus (*sic*) it occurs in the New Testament," etc. He cites cases, renders it wash (*lavare*) each time, or baptizo—"not only to wash, but even to wash one's self can be proved by many passages. Hence, it is transferred to the solemn rite of baptism." He shows where, in this connection, the Greek *baptidzo* interchanged in many codices (MSS.) with *rantidzo, sprinkle*. He continues: "4. Metaphorically, as the Latin (*imbuo*) to imbue, to give and administer to copiously, POUR FORTH (*profundo*) abundantly." Such is the testimony of this learned lexicographer. His sense is—*baptidzo* is not used modally in the New Testament at all. It is used for an ordinance, a rite. It may be performed in any mode possible—*dip, sprinkle, pour*. In the mere sense of dip, etc., it never occurs there—in the *classic* sense it never occurs, as in Diodorus Sic. 1, Strabo, Polybius—in the mere sense of "*tabhal* and *tabha*" in Hebrew. Note, he gives "pour" as one of its New Testament uses.

25. Passow. We reserve this to the *last*, because it is admitted by *all* scholars—German, English, American—by immersionists and affusionists to be the most learned, most scientific and critical of all Greek lexicons ever issued—1841—being in three large volumes, the one I hold having 1,884 pages in it, double column, fine print. Hence, the falsity of Liddell and Scott, whose lexicon, far smaller than this *one* volume, though coarser print also, is claimed to be *an enlargement* of this! It is in German. "*Baptidzo*, from *bapto*, 1, oft and repeatedly to immerse, to submerge, with *eis* and *pros*, etc. Thence, to moisten, to wet, sprinkle (*benetzen, anfeuchten, begiessen* ubr., *ubergiessen, überschütten, überhaufen, etc.*) generally TO BESPRINKLE, TO POUR UPON, to overwhelm, to burden with taxes, debts, etc. 3. to baptize, suffer one's self to be baptized; also to bathe, to wash." Such is Passow's and Rost's testimony

Where now this cry of no lexicon defining *baptidzo* to sprinkle nor to pour? What will they say now? Will they cease such publications? Or will they go on as before, and repeat the same old song with ears deaf, and necks hardened against all the facts in the case?

There is another class of lexicons in the Greek, we must notice. Budaeus, 1519. H. Stephanus, 1572. Scapula, 1579. Pasow, Hedericus, Schrevellius, etc., being all abridgements directly from Stephanus, and he the same as Budaeus. These all give (1) for classic meaning, sink and overwhelm. (2) They do not define it by dip, the very thing our opponents all want. (3) Not one of them gives any other New Testament meaning than *abluo*, *lavo*, cleanse, wash. They all being mere abridgements, Budaeus and Stephanus alone deserve attention. They carefully separate the New Testament meaning from the classic meaning. While they carefully define it by words that cover our case, by a word that while it means to wash (*lavo*) is also defined besprinkle by every Latin lexicon we ever saw, yet they never give dip or immerse as a New Testament or Bible meaning at all. Hence, we have now over thirty authorities, from the stand-point of simple lexicography, with us, and against our opponent.

This is the more valuable, when we remember that Budaeus and Stephanus were reared and wrote their lexicons under the supreme reign of dipping—when dipping was the law and almost universal practice. See Conant, Baptizein, 138-9, law in England for dipping, as lately reinforced in 1662, and observed as such by J. Wesley, 1736, in the colony of Georgia, because a royal statute required it, and Wall, ii. 581, note on Dr. Whittaker, 1624.

It must be remembered, that as late as 1470 there was not a man in France, England or Germany that could read Greek, nor up till then had a grammar or lexicon of the Greek been published in either of those countries. Hence, a scientific or philological treatment of the subject could not be as yet expected. The sympathy of all the early lexicographers of France and England was with immersionists. Hence, quotations from Aquinas, Scotus, etc., 13th century, as well as many

others we see in Booth and Baptist works, amount to nothing on such a question as this, their opinion being worth no more than it would be on astronomy, and for the same reason.

But our opponents, so confident in lexicography, will not, dare not risk their cause with the lexicons. Far from it. President J. M. Pendleton, of Pennsylvania, formerly of Tennessee, in "Why I am a Baptist," 86, 96; Dr A. Carson, 23, 46, 55-6; Ingham, 43; A. Campbell, 114, 122, 127; Brents, 263-9; Conant and Gale and Fuller throughout, and Prof. Ripley, unite in the sentiment: "Use is the sole arbiter of language." Lexicons "do not constitute the ULTIMATE authority." To the original Greek, therefore, and the fundamental laws of language, the science of word building, of philology, we have to go. If you will turn your telescope to the philological heavens, now for the next day or so, you will see great auroras of Greek light blazing across the sky; the canons of awful criticism will thunder in your ears, and Greek fire light up all your houses.

In a word—now is the time to test the fundamental principles on which our opponents build their superstructure, test their value, and try all these so-called canons, by which they propose to prove their propositions. If we are to appeal to language, we propose that it be in good faith that we do so appeal, and not to fly back from the consequences. The day has come when our claims here are to be tried on the merits of the case, by the strictest laws of language—by methods that are scientific—not superficial, empirical.

Immersionists rely upon the following as settled principles and facts in philology:

1. That if *baptizō* or any word means to dip or immerse, it never can mean to sprinkle or to pour. Dr. Fuller, 15, 25; Carson, 52, Ingham, 104, 109, 184, 9; A. Campbell, Christian Baptism, 147-9; Fraser, 70; Hinton, 44; Wilson, 184-5, etc., etc.

2. That wash is always a meaning of *baptizō*, from the idea of dipping—a result of it.

I now appeal to Dr. Graves, and ask him, and all his learned associates here: Is not the study of languages to proceed

as any of the sciences, by first collecting all the facts possible, and then proceeding by inductive reasoning? He is bound to answer, Yes. Have the authors—any of them, done this, or attempted it, as far as this word is concerned, after a scientific method? Can he name two lexicons that are not translations or abridgments, the one of the other, or both from one, that render this word alike? He cannot. Take Schleusner's two lexicons—one for New Testament, the other for Septuagint Greek—his definitions of *baptidzo* are wholly different—radically different. Take Wahl, a noted lexicographer as well as Schleusner, of the present century. In two editions of the same year, 1829, his definitions are radically different as to order, and everything reversed. In a third edition, 1831, he changes it again, erasing immerse, and inserting sprinkle, just as he had erased *lavo*, wash, besprinkle, from its place, and in the second edition inserted immerse. If science were underlying his superstructure, it could not totter thus.

We now propose to prove the following facts:

1. That no lexicon gives immerse or dip as a meaning of *baptidzo* in Greek, earlier than B. C. 165. *i. e.* Polybius; next, Diodorus Siculus, B. C. 66 to 32; next, Strabo, B. C. 54 to A. D. 54; next, Josephus and Plutarch, till A. D. 120.

2. That *baptidzo* never means to dip.

3. That, though it means in later classic Greek to immerse, it is a derived, a *late*, *remote* meaning, as well as a *rare* one.

4. That by all the laws of language, the science of language, sprinkle is the primary meaning of the word.

5. That all the facts, all dates, all the laws of all kindred or remoter languages completely sustain and demonstrate this fact.

I am to show, then, first, that no lexicon gives immerse or dip as a meaning in Greek, earlier than Polybius. This only requires a dip into them; a glance. Wahl, the most favorable to immersion of all lexicons, gives Josephus first, Polybius next; he is the oldest, he quotes for it, or at all. Swarzius, Polybius first and oldest that he quotes; so of Stephanus, Liddell and Scott. Some lexicons begin with Plutarch, some with Diodorus Siculus, some with Josephus, a few

with Polybius; not one goes higher up than to him for immerse. So Terretinus and Delingius begin with Plutarch. Not one ever quotes authority for a *literal* meaning of *baptidzo* earlier than the same ones just given. This is far down in the decline, in the Iron Age of Greek. Is that science? Is that philology? This proves one thing, at least: These lexicons were not discussing *primaries*, nor how meanings were derived. That field is all virgin soil yet; an unexplored sea, so far as *baptidzo* is concerned.

The Greek language had been spoken 1,400 years before Diodorus Siculus and these authors flourished. It had been reduced to written forms nearly a thousand years before these men flourished! What changes, what revolutions occurred during these centuries of change, of toil, of wars, of revolutions, and how absurd to seize a late, a remote, a rare meaning, as not only the primary one, but the only one.

Second, we will now demonstrate that immerse is a *rare* and *late* meaning, and dip no meaning at all. And (1), the lexicons sufficiently attest that immerse is the latest of all the meanings of *baptidzo*; (2), the texts they always cite, demonstrate that dip is never a meaning of *baptidzo*. Let Dr. Graves examine them and find one that means dip; a single citation given by any lexicon in classic Greek; (3), we propose to prove the entire proposition just made, by the highest immersion authorities in the world—that have lived, or do live.

a. Here, let it be remembered, they have all appealed their cause to the last and highest court, the originals in Greek, the classics themselves.

b. Let it be carefully noted that this has been chosen as their *best* and *main* support; the Gibraltar of defense; the lair where they think to turn upon their pursuer with hope of successful resistance.

c. We take their own rendering, when avowedly writing and translating to support their practices by the classics.

d. Before we summon our witnesses, let us hear what these immersion luminaries wish to prove; for which, like giants, they hurl such fearful missiles:

1. Dr. Cox, Baptist, says :

"The idea of dipping is *in every instance* [of *bapto* and *baptidzo*] conveyed."

2. Booth, the great standard of Baptists and disciples :

"*Baptidzo* is a specific term. [So says constantly, A. Campbell, e. g., p. 148.] The English expression dip, is a specific term." 284.

3. Dr. Gale, learned Baptist :

"Dipping, only, is baptism."

4. Roger Williams, professed founder in America of the Baptists :

"Dipping is baptizing, and baptizing is dipping."

5. Dr. A. Carson :

"My position is, that it ALWAYS signifies to dip." Page 55.

6. A. Campbell, disciple :

"All the learned admit that its [*baptidzo*] primary, proper, and unfigurative meaning is to dip. * * * For all allow that dip is the primary and proper meaning of *bapto*." He asserts that *baptidzo* "inherits the proper meaning of *bap*, [the root syllable] which is dip." Christian Baptism, 120.

This, then, is settled ; *baptidzo*, according to Baptist authorities, and A. Campbell, always means to dip ; nothing else. Dip is the action of their baptism.

Let us now present their great lights in Europe and America, past and present, on this subject. Let me begin with Dr. J. M. Pendleton, bosom friend in the past with Dr. Graves.

1. Prof. Pendleton—"Why I am a Baptist." From page 97 to 100, cites *baptidzo* 22 times. Out of these 22 cases, he renders *baptidzo* "immerse" twice; that is 20 against two. He renders it dip, only once; that is 21 against one ! Think of that ! Once only, does he find *baptidzo*, to his satisfaction, meaning to dip !

2. Dr. Gale, Baptist, result—18 against three immerse ! Yea, and 18 against three to dip, in classic usage. In Bible and Apocrypha, outside the ordinance, which is the point to be proved, he has three against one dip.

3. Dr. R. Fuller, Baptist, has it sink 12 times, immerse three, dip one ; 21 against one dip !

4. M. Stuart, Pedobaptist, summing up all the arguments for immersion, endorsed on that part by all the Baptists who now write, especially by Dr. Graves, who publishes it to aid

their cause; result: Of 41 citations on *baptidzo*, immerse 3 times, dip once; overwhelm 22 times, overflow once. Here, we have 38 cases, against three for immerse; 40 against one for dip!

5. Dr. A. Carson, the favorite Baptist, prince of their debaters in Europe or America—31 citations. Of these, immerse three times, dip three times; *i. e.*, 28 against three dip! Yet he said it always meant to dip!

6. Conant, head of Bible translators, prince of Baptist scholars in the East—New York. Out of 63 consecutive cases, pages 43 to 82, immerse 10, whelm 45, overwhelm 8; that is, 53 against 10 for immerse; 63 against no dip! Does it always mean to dip? Of uncompounded occurrences, classic use, 141. Of these 141 cases, dip seven times; that is, 134 against seven for dip! It always means to dip, does it!

7. Ingham, Baptist, who had Conant, Carson, Gale and A. Campbell, Booth, etc., before him. Of 169 occurrences of *baptidzo*, he renders it overwhelm 50 times; dip, once! That is 168 cases against one for dip! Does *baptidzo* ALWAYS signify to dip?

8. We must not pass A. Campbell here. He was a scar-worn veteran; an Ajax in this water war. In his maturest work, Christian Baptism, he cites *baptidzo* 24 times. He renders it sink 10 times, overwhelm 10 times, overflow one; but of the entire list, he does not render it dip a single time. *Bapto*, the root, he renders dip constantly on the same pages, and his renderings, as a whole, are the most accurate, just and faithful we have ever seen from the immersion side.

Let it sound through the land; tell it everywhere, ye lovers of truth and fair dealing, that the prince of all American debaters, who carried war, they say, to the gates of Babylon, if he did not against the gates of Zion rather, hero of Bethany, after wading through a thousand years of Greek, and elbow deep in folios and musty alcoves, burdened with the lore of centuries, when asserting that dip is its "primary, proper and unfigurative meaning," returns to day, to light, to a thirsty panting, anxious people empty of results; not a case of dip in all the classic field! Enough on that point; it

is made out. The sum of all these renderings is 457, against 18 for dip! These 18 cases are false renderings, as the rendering of Conant, Ingham, Stuart, and A. Campbell demonstrate. A careful examination of the case in Plutarch, the strongest in their estimation they have, will show it is not dip.

In no instance on earth do the classics apply baptidzo to any act that is the baptism of the Baptists; not once do they. In no instance does it apply to the action of their baptism.

Having demonstrated from immersion sources, of such weight also, that, first, *baptidzo* does not mean to dip; second, that immerse is a rare meaning; we proceed now, third, to prove that it is a *derived* as well as a *later* meaning of *baptidzo*.

a. The assumption that *bapto* and *baptidzo* are exactly the same in meaning, save that *bapto* applies to staining, dyeing, etc., and *baptidzo* never, is utterly untrue, and the renderings of Carson, Stuart, A. Campbell, Conant and Ingham show it. If they did not, an appeal to the texts at once demonstrates it.

b. Carson, Ingham, Conant, etc., have demonstrated that the old rules relied on by Vossius, Beza, Suicer, Witsius, Terretinus, Casaubon, etc., in defining *baptidzo*, and accounting for its meaning, is all a monstrous blunder. We leave it with them. In it these old writers insist that it differs from *dunai* on the one hand for certain reasons, and from *epipolidzo* on the other, etc. See Carson 65-6; Conant 88-89.

c. A. Campbell, Judd, Conant, Carson, Ingham, Pres. Pendleton and Dr. J. R. Graves, all feel satisfied that the laws of philology on which most of these men relied to prove that *baptidzo* also came to mean sprinkle, pour, are all false, and demolished. Indeed, as they feel that they have demolished the canons of the old school, we propose to prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that **THEIR** laws of language are equally unreliable—untrue.

1. The very fact that the lexicons assign to no writer earlier than Polybius, B. C. 165 years, the meaning of immerse under the word, is proof, as far as lexicons go. But we readily grant, as all scholars will do, that they are not an "ultimate

authority" at all. But second, as *baptidzo* occurs centuries before Polybius, and in metaphorical senses as well as in a literal sense long before his day, it clearly points to an earlier meaning, which can easily be determined by the laws of language. Let us see some of the universally admitted meanings of *baptidzo* in classic and Bible or Scriptural Greek. Conant gives it fourteen meanings. A. Campbell gives it in all his works—full twenty. Among its recognized meanings are intoxicate, wash, cleanse, whelm, overflow, overwhelm, and these are among its early meanings—long before it meant immerse.

3. By no law of language can you derive these meanings from immerse or dip as a primary. Take the definite and most decisive words for dip or immerse either—in all Aryan and Semitic languages, and you (1) never find their meanings derived thence; (2) they cannot be so derived in the very nature of things, because so opposite in the great essential points of connection. Hence, the words for immerse and dip in Greek, *enduo*, *buthidzo*, *pontidzo*, *kataduo*, *katapontidzo*, *dupto*, never mean to wash; never mean to intoxicate, burden with taxes; never to whelm, overflow or overwhelm; never to wash. The Latin *mergo*, *immergo*, *demergo*, *submergo*, (*intingo* is dip); the Hebrew *tabha*, *kaphash*, *shakha*; the Persic, *ghuta*, Ethiopic, *maab*, *maba*, Arabic, *gatta*, *gamara*, *quamasa*, all mean to immerse. German, *sinken*, *tauchen*, *undertauchen*, *cin-tauchen*—immerse, dip; English, sink, dip; where and when do they come to mean wash, overflow, whelm, overwhelm, or to asperse or abuse? The acknowledged meanings, then, of *baptidzo*, CANNOT be derived from dip or immerse. Hence, neither of these were primary meanings of the word.

4. "Overflow" is the meaning of *baptidzo* in Aristotle, nearly 200 years before Polybius. Hence, as *baptidzo* meant overflow quite 200 years before it meant immerse, it cannot be derived from immerse as a meaning!

5. It meant "overwhelm" in Plato; so rendered by all lexicons, by all Baptists, by A. Campbell, by all, so far as we have noticed, every time it occurs in Plato. Here, we find *baptidzo* meaning overwhelm, the element *applied to the object*—

coming upon it, nearly two centuries and a half before we find it meaning to immerse. Hence, such a *late child* cannot be the *parent* of such a *remote* ancestor. Nor *can* overwhelm be derived from immerse or dip.

6. Drs. Gale, Cox, Morell, Mell, admit that *baptidzo* applies to cases where "the water comes over it"—baptized by "superfusion." So A. Campbell, in the case of Elijah's altar on which 12 pitchers (as the Hebrew reads) of water were poured. Origen, Basil, and other Greeks calling it baptizing the altar, the wood, that it "overwhelmed, as it were the altar." Here was baptism, also, by "superfusion" from their own standpoint. [See Gale, *Reflec. on Wall*, ii, 76; Ingham, 26, 27, 62]. "The abundant pouring of water on the altar, of which we have an account in 1 Kings, xvii, 32-35, and which was done thrice, is spoken of by Origen as a baptism," 62. So speaks Mr. Ingham, Baptist. Now, aside from questions about specific action here, dip, etc., how can "superfusion," "overwhelming;" clear and admitted cases of pouring; cases where the baptizing element comes over, comes upon, is poured upon the object; be derived from dip, from sink, etc.; from immerse? When did a word that properly and primarily meant immerse come derivatively to have such a meaning? *Never! never!*

7. But we now proceed to prove that words primarily meaning to sprinkle by common consent, and by all the facts; others that mean to moisten, where it is by affusion of liquids, to wit: Where it is by affusion—often of tears, dew, rain, juices of plants, vegetable matter; etc., do come, derivatively, to mean *all that baptidzo means*; all that is claimed for it or for *bapto*. This will (1), refute the boasted law on which immersionists feel willing to risk their case. [Ingham, p. 108-9; Hinton, 31; A. Campbell, 147-8; Carson, 52; Fuller, 15, 25]; that if the word ever means immerse or dip—(or dye, Carson)—it can never mean sprinkle or pour. (2), it will reconcile all difficulties; bring out the whole beauty of language, and give us a firm, immovable foundation on which to stand.

Of a vast number of words that I have traced out, let us present a few from different branches of the two great families

of languages in which the Bible and its versions and literature come down to us—Semitic and Aryan. We can only give a few of the many as samples.

1. *Garakha*, Arabic, Primarily, it is to bedew, drop water, rain, dilute gently with tears; yet it comes to mean submerge, immerse, immersed in the sea, Castel. Shindler gives sweat, pour, (*fundit*), yet repeats the definition immerse 20 times.

2. *Chamits*; *Heb. Chal.*, to sprinkle with water; Schindler, sprinkle. (*Chamits*), Gesenius Thesaurus, *sprinkle* (*conspersa*). Yet it is to stain, dye, color, to dip, to immerse, Castel—(*intingere, immergere*).

3. *Mathoth*, Hebrew, sprinkle, immerse, immersion, Castel.

4. *Shataph*, Hebrew, Primarily, to trickle down, let fall, distill—"To gush or pour forth"—Gesenius—noun-form—"a pouring rain," "An out-pouring rain, raingust,"—Furst. Now note and trace this word. Primarily it is to trickle down, shed drops, let fall, distil.

In Leviticus it comes to mean to wash; occurring three times, rendered *kludzo* in the Greek version.

Next, still later, in 1 Kings, xxii, 38, it means to wash, applied to washing a *chariot*. We know the mode. Later, in Jeremiah and Ezekiel frequently it occurs, meaning to overflow, overwhelm. Dan. xi, 10, also it means overflow, metaphorically. It still applies to such a "pouring rain," Ezekiel xxxviii, 22, as overflows. Later still it comes to mean *immerse*, and is so defined by Buxtorff and all the authorities defining its *later* meaning. Its uses show it.

5. The Chaldee word *tseva*. This word only occurs in Daniel; is a Chaldee, Arabic and Syriac, but not a Hebrew, word. It is thus defined by Rabbi Furst, "to moisten, to besprinkle, to baptize." It is translated by Jerome, sprinkle—(*conspersatur*). Its root meaning is to sprinkle, shed forth. In later Chaldee, Targum of Jonathan Ben Uzziel it is often used for wash, rendered from *kabas* in Hebrew, wash. Later still, it came to apply to partial dips. Later still, it meant immerse also.

6 One more Semitic word—Hebrew and Arabic—*balal*, *balala*. The root meaning is by all the great standards,

(1), Freytag—Arabic lexicon—to moisten, and especially to wet or macerate by sprinkling or gentle affusion of liquid —(*asperso aut leviter affuso humore.*)

2. Castel “Moisten and specially wet or macerate by sprinkling.”

3. Gesenius: “To wet, moisten by affusion of liquid—*phal phal*—same root; sprinkle, (*consperisit*).”

4. Leigh: “Sprinkle, (*consperisit*).”

5. Schindler: “Pour, sprinkle.”

Yet this word comes ultimately to mean “to dip,” “to dip in”—so rendered by the lexicons, (*intinxit*—Schindler), and is the Arabic translation of Luke xvi, 24; John xiii, 26, of *bapto*, “that he may *dip* the tip of his finger in water,” “when I have dipped it.” To the same purpose we could quote *shabal*, *natsach*, *nakha*, *tsuph*, *shapha*, *rathav*, *lathar*, etc., more or less: all covering leading meanings of *bapto* and *baptidzo*, beginning with sprinkle or its equivalent.

In the Greek, the following will do: (1), *kludzo*, Passow: wash, bedash, wet. The Glosses, sprinkle, (*aspergo*, *perfuno*). Budaeus and Stephanus, *periklusmati*, sprinkling, (*aspergine*). Groves, *perikludzo*, “to wash all round or all over, dash water, sprinkle all over.” Its primary force was to sprinkle or bedash with water, where more or less force occurred. *Clyster* is its noun; to that oftenest it is applied in earlier Greek. Yet in Aristotle even, it means to overflow when strengthened by a preposition—*kata*; and in late Greek, Achilles Tatius, etc., it applies to floods, inundations, overflowings commonly. Hence Stephanus, Schrevellius, etc., render it “submerge, to be submerged.”

See now how the law operates. Primarily *baptidzo* is to sprinkle. The same word constantly means in Greek, Hebrew, Latin, Arabic, both to sprinkle and to pour. From pouring of rain, of water or rain, comes wash as a meaning. The roots of herbs, dust, all soiling elements, are washed off from trees, vegetable matter, houses, fences, by pouring rains. From pouring rains we have overflow. That is a derived meaning of *baptidzo* we see. From same we have overwhelm.

From overwhelm we have, as the effect of being overwhelmed, sink, immerse. Thus the philology is perfect, and sprinkle demonstrated as the primary meaning of *baptizo*, by all the laws of philology in the world—by all the demonstrated science of language. If words are to be used in their PRIMARY sense, and only thus in the New Testament, WE ONLY ARE BAPTIZED—NO BAPTIST IS!—[*Time up.*]

DR. GRAVES' SECOND SPEECH.

[Replication.]

MR. PRESIDENT:—The speech of Elder Ditzler shows that he possesses great familiarity with a great many languages, or at least with their *lexicons*. Besides Latin, Greek and Hebrew, he has the Chaldean, the Arabic, the Syriac, the Coptic, and I know not what Asiatic and African dialects—to say nothing of the Cherokee, Creek and Choctaw—all at his finger ends. And what was all this array of learning and erudition designed to effect? I confess I am utterly at a loss to conjecture, unless it was to substantiate that strangest of all positions—a position so utterly unfounded and untenable that I cannot but commiserate the man whom the exigencies of his argument compel to have recourse to it, *to wit*: that until within the last forty or fifty years, the most eminent scholars of all countries were utterly ignorant of philology, the etymology and derivation of the terms of even their own mother tongue; but his lexicons, save one, are all against him. If such was actually the condition of affairs, then the jurist and the philosopher would have been unable to use language with that clearness and precision which I had supposed was essential to a lucid and scientific presentation of their teachings. This, I confess, is truly wonderful! It is utterly strange and unheard of. I listened most attentively as my opponent proceeded with his disjointed and—as I cannot but regard it—incoherent harangue, but I candidly confess that, at least three-fourths of it, I was unable to understand or to see its drift. You, Mr. President, may have understood it, but I confess I did not. I could not see any *relevancy* of, at least, three-fourths of it, to the question at issue.

I understand my friend's position to be, that the primary meaning of *baptizo* is *to sprinkle*—or *pour*—*primary*, observe, not secondary or general. And to sustain this, a great array of lexical authorities has been introduced. We are after *facts*, however, and not *fancies*, and shall hereafter have an

opportunity of testing the value of these citations. Well, this is a square issue; something, therefore, has been gained by the morning's speeches. 1. We are agreed, as to the principles of interpretation, and 2, in our resolve to stand by them. That, too, is a matter for mutual gratulation, as being a propitious omen. We shall all profit by it. I intend to make the word of God the man of my counsel, not some philological theory, based upon a *usus loquendi*, of which we have no traces except in a period far anterior to the building of Rome. I say to you, it is with this Book, we have to do; it is by this Word we have to be governed. If Elder Ditzler made one impression stronger than another by his array of authorities, abounding in discrepancies, it was this, that it must be a most difficult matter to understand the meaning of the Sacred text! He says that, with reference to this word *baptidzo*, one authority gives one meaning and another another meaning. If this is the case where scholars are concerned, what are the common people to do? How are they to know what to do? In the name of Jesus Christ, I protest against this. He even affirmed that the meaning of terms in the Greek New Testament, cannot be learned from classical Greek; that it is not the same Greek! I assert that the inspired writers wrote in the language of that age, and a Greek child of fifteen years could have understood it. Now in regard to the meaning of this term *baptidzo*, I will quote from Sophocles, a native Greek, and professor of the Greek language in Yale College. He says: "*Baptidzo* means, *mergo, tingo, to immerse, to dip, in the New Testament, everywhere.*"

There can be produced no authority of greater weight than Sophocles upon this point—a native Greek, familiar with the ancient and the modern Greek, as well as with the Greek of the New Testament—and he says it is the same Greek. *Baptidzo* means, in the New Testament, what it means in Josephus, Strabo or Plutarch.

Argument from John's Baptism.

1. JOHN'S BAPTISM WAS BY IMMERSION ONLY.—In opening the New Testament we find the Harbinger of the Messiah, ushering in the Gospel Dispensation as the morning star announ-

ces the king of day. He was the first to administer Christian baptism by the authority of the King of Zion, who afterwards fixed this rite by His own royal enactment, as a permanent ordinance in His church forever, having received it himself at the hands of John.

I therefore propose to inquire for the *usus loquendi* of the only term employed by John himself, and by Christ and the Evangelists when speaking of this rite, or in recording the circumstances of its administration during John's ministry.

To assist my hearers to follow me with ease, I shall raise two simple questions which, by the record before me, *can* be answered by a child of twelve years as well as by the profoundest scholar of earth, or the Judge of the Supreme Court.

Less than one hundred verses in the records of the Evangelists, contain all the references to John's baptism and ministry, that bear upon these questions.

Let us have constantly before our minds, the two important rules of interpretation, *to wit*:

1. That the *primary* or *literal* meaning is *the only true one*, and that we must adopt this in *all* cases, *unless the sense positively forbids*.

Mark which one of us, throughout this discussion, will be compelled to violate this rule to sustain his practice.

2. The other rule is: "We are not at liberty to affix an arbitrary sense to a word, nor can the meaning of a word be *diverse* or *multifarious* at the same time."

This means that no one Greek word, as *baptidzo*, can mean to sprinkle, to pour water upon, to pop and to dip a person into—they being words of *diverse* significations. If it means sprinkle, it cannot mean to dip, or immerse. Notice who thus confounds them.

It should be understood by all, that some two hundred and sixty-four years ago, this version of the Sacred Scripture was made by order of King James of England, from the Hebrew and the Greek languages, by a Company of Pedobaptist scholars. There were sundry words they did not translate at all into English, and Baptists claim that some words and phrases they *mis-*

translated, so as not to injure, but rather to *favor* the practices of the Church of England; and thus, after finishing their work, they congratulate themselves to the King for what they had done: *See Int. to King James' Bible.*

Ed. Beecher, on p. 5, of his work, *The Import of Baptism*, says of the translators' treatment of *baptizo*:

"At the time of the translation of the Bible, a controversy had arisen as it regards the import of the word, so that, although it was conceded to have an import in the original, yet it was impossible to assign to it in English any meaning, *without seeming to take sides in the controversy then pending.*

"Accordingly, *in order to take neither side*, they did not attempt to give the sense of the term in a significant English word, but merely transferred the word *baptidz*, with a slight alteration of termination, to our language. The consequence was that it did not exhibit its original significancy to the mind of the English reader, or indeed any significancy, except what was derived from its application to designate an external visible rite. In short, it became merely the name of a rite, and had a usage strictly technical, and lost to the ear whatever significance it originally had."

Baptists also claim that they have not dealt fairly with "*en*," and "*eis*," when the true and proper translation of these prepositions would have favored immersion.

With these explanations, let us examine the record given of John's ministry. I open to the 3d chapter of Matthew. Read:

"In (*en*) those days came John the Baptist, preaching (*en*) in the wilderness of Judea."

The first word I would call your attention to, is the preposition "*en*," which occurs twice in this first verse, and which the translators very correctly translated *in*, which, according to *all* Greek lexicons, is its *primary* and *usual* signification. It as often means *in*, in Greek, as *in*, means *in*, in English; and *eis*, as often means *into* in Greek as *into* means *into*, in English, and therefore all lexicons give *in* as the primary and usual signification of "*en*," and "*into*," as the literal definition of *eis*.

Let us read on, noting the use of these prepositions, and *baptizo*:

"And were baptized of him (*en*) in Jordan, confessing their sins."
Matthew iii, 6.

And were all *baptized* of him "*in* the Jordan."

Now mark, the *people* were baptized *in* the river Jordan—not the river baptized upon them. The question before us now, is: What did John do to the people *in* the river Jordan? This Greek verb with an English ending does not tell us.

The matter in dispute between Elder Ditzler and myself is—if he will presume to dispute about this case—whether John sprinkled or poured the *people* into the river, or sprinkled or poured the river upon them, or *immersed* them *in* the river.

The first, you all know, he could not have done, for while you can sprinkle water or sand and pour out any liquid, you cannot sprinkle or pour out men and women. We are not allowed to suppose that he sprinkled or poured the river upon them, for the record forbids it; the people is the object of the verb baptized, and not the river or the waters of it. Immerse alone will make sense, and the context demands it, and so we are *compelled* to adopt it. The people were put into the river.

It is worthy of note that *en* is found eighteen times in *this* chapter, and they translated it in every instance *in*, except the *two* places where it refers to baptism! Why was this? Is it impossible to use the *primary* meaning here? Does the sense or the context forbid it? I affirm that the primary meaning will not only make sense, but that the context *demand*s it, and therefore translate it as it is in *all the older versions*, including even the Catholic—in water—in the Holy Spirit and in fire.—
[*Time out.*]

DR. DITZLER'S SECOND SPEECH.

BROTHER MODERATORS:—The Doctor seems to misunderstand the point I made this morning. I now refer to it because I want you to keep in mind what I said and what I meant.

After animadverting somewhat loosely on what I said, he goes on to state that, according to me, people were, until within the last forty years or so, utterly mistaken in regard to the meaning of Greek terms. My statement implied nothing of the sort. I guarded against that. What I did say was, that the process of tracing up the primary or original sense in which words were employed is a perfectly modern science. Our advantage, therefore, over those that preceded us is, that we have a more certain and satisfactory means of determining what is the *primary* meaning of a word. We are now able to show by what law of science two meanings may be derived from the primary. That point he has not touched, nor ever will touch; never, because it cannot be touched. The argument we made can never be touched while the world stands. Did not my worthy brother take up the question of primary meaning? Did he not take the position that the meaning, primary and secondary, must be found in the lexicons? The context must determine in which sense a word is used. We have to find what the authors themselves intended by the terms they employed. Moses Stuart leaves the question in entire doubt, as to the primary meaning of *bapto* and *baptido*, saying it was uncertain. So everybody else leaves it that does not recognize that law of scientific investigation to which I have referred. The first meaning set down by lexicographers is the meaning that appears at first sight of the occurrences, they happen to have the *current* meaning, but this is by no means the primary meaning.

Now, I appeal to every man in this house; to the ignorant as well as the educated, whether my worthy opponent has

uttered a single word, or adduced a solitary fact, to show that he has any scientific ground for his theory that dip or immerse is the primary meaning of *baptizo*? To show what its primary meaning is, a man has to trace up the word and find what its *first* meaning was at a period no less remote than 1500 years before Christ. *Primary*; what does that mean? Does it not mean the first? Then, as *baptizo*, in the sense of immerse, is never found in any Greek writer until about 165 years before Christ, and as this was among the latest meanings the word came to have, how absurd to call it its *primary* meaning. That the current meaning is the primary one, I know Baptists all assume; but there is no science in it; such an assumption is in utter contravention of the recognized laws of philological investigation. To come down fourteen or fifteen hundred years in the history of a language, and then to seize on some new meaning that has been engrafted on an old word, and then to claim that this is its primary meaning, is an absurdity too transparent to require refutation.

As to Sophocles, he treats only of *Iron Age* Greek—is not an authority in the learned world—and is not to be compared with any one of the greater lexicographers we gave, among whom were native Greeks also—Gazes, e. g., giving *poured upon*, while *Sophocles* says, “perform ablution, *bathed in tears*—Gr. baptized, *dakrusi with tears* to baptize—New Testament everywhere.

Dr. G. started on *philology*, and to our amazement cut across for Jordan at once, abandoning all his line. I’ll get there in time.

As we have nothing further to answer, we resume where we left off. The great issue on this question, from the stand-point of our opponent, turns upon the primary meaning of *baptizo*, which involves the science of language—fundamental principles of philology. Hence we resume where we stopped. We were showing that great numbers of words that primarily meant to sprinkle, to pour, to moisten—where it is by sprinkling—came to mean all that *baptizo* ever means. On the contrary, no word in existence that properly or primarily

means to immerse ever comes to mean what all agree *baptizo* does mean—have its applications.

2. *Katantao*: “To sprinkle or pour, sprinkle upon, to pour upon.” See Passow, Stephanus, Galen, Dunbar and Pickering: “To pour upon, to bathe with water, to soothe with eloquence, to overwhelm with or pour out ridicule upon one.”

Notice well this word of effusion. It covers a number of meanings in *baptizo*; among them to pour ridicule upon—*i. e.*, pour a torrent of abuse upon one. Notice the overwhelm from pour upon.

3. *Brecho*. This word is also doubly important because two native Greek lexicographers define both *bapto* and *baptizo* with it, while the learned Schneider, in his lexicon, puts it as the general equivalent of *baptizo* as the general import.

Passow: “To wet, moisten, sprinkle; passive, to be wet, receive moisture, be wet with rain, to rain; to tipple, be drunk, overfill with wine, drunk, pour upon, overwhelm.”

Pickering: “Moisten, wet, water, bedew, sprinkle, etc., rain, shower, wet, soak, drink.” Yet *embrecho* is by the lexicons, dip, immerse repeatedly. Stephanus, *intingere*, *immergere*, dip, immerse. Passow, to soak, dip in.

4. *Dewo*, *endewo*; *madidus* would show like results. So the Latin *maleso*, *madidus*, wet, moist, soft, intoxicated, drunkened, soaked, dipped, dyed. Bullion's Latin lexicon, 1869. See White's late one also. *Tingo*, Greek *tengo*, would show same principles. *Zurak*, in Arabic; sprinkle, besprinkle, then color, dye. *Mattatha*, moisten with ointment or paint, perfuse, etc., then immerse one's self in water, immersion. In a word, words never begin with immerse as their primary meaning, and then come to mean what all parties admit *bapto* and *baptizo* mean. Such a process is wholly opposed to all the laws of language.

On the contrary, all the laws and the whole science of language show conclusively that the only method by which the facts, viz., the phenomena of the facts of *bapto* and *baptizo*, can be harmonized, is by starting with sprinkle as its primary force. We have thus demonstrated our third, fourth and fifth propositions.

Let us now see if these phenomena of language do not hold good as applied to the actual facts as further discovered in the earlier Greek. We appeal to the earlier Greek classics. It is in vain that a Casaubon, or Vossius, Beza, etc., should appeal to a Plutarch, or a Polybius, fifteen to eighteen hundred years from the birth and spoken form, and a thousand from the written form in which the Greek appeared, to find out thence what were primary meanings, when even they never dreamed of comparative philology and great underlying laws by which word-building went on, and meanings developed. Their opinion is nothing *here*.

We see that the lexicons all stop with Polybius as the earliest writer that uses *baptizo* in the sense of immerse. He also uses it in other senses. They give him also as the earliest using it literally. He flourished some 165 years B. C. They cite Plato, born B. C. 429, as the earliest for a metaphorical meaning, he using it three times, always metaphorically; twice for intoxicate, rendered "overwhelm" by Conant, Carson, A. Campbell, etc., always. Is this science? Is it philology? Polybius, living in the decline of the iron age of the Greek—Plutarch, Josephus—who will risk his reputation now by saying such is the process by which we are to discover the laws of language? Such empiricism is gone forever. The method of science requires that we collect all the earliest cases of the word to be found, record their dates, discover the respective meanings, literal or metaphorical, then apply the inductive method, and discover the truth of the phenomena, the laws that will harmonize all the facts. First, get the facts. Then no law is correct, no method safe, that will not explain the facts, assign a why, how. We have already made much headway. We will test the matter further.

1. The first Greek that has yet been found to use *baptidzo* is Pindar, born B. C. 522 years. He uses it but once in a metaphorical sense for slander, abuse, the rage and vituperation of his enemies and its impotence. "For, as when the rest of the net is toiling deep in the sea, I, as a cork, am above the net, unbaptized of the sea—i. e., by its raging, dashing waters." Literally, I am unbaptized of its salt water—that is, their rage no more hurts him than the sea water,

with all its salt, which is fearfully biting, hurts or affects the cork. Some might render, overwhelm the cork.

2. Aristophanes, born B. C. 450, uses it next, once. He uses it metaphorically also, thus: "For he is praised," says he. "because he baptized (*ebaptisen*) the stewards," poured a torrent of abuse upon them.

3. Plato, born B. C. 429, uses it three times, metaphorically each time. Once, when Clinias, a youth, was baptized with questions—questions put to him so rapidly that he became overwhelmed or confused with them. In the other two cases, the parties were "baptized with wine;" rendered overwhelmed by all immersionist writers.

4. Alcibiades, born B. C. 400, alluding to the offensive and opprobrious epithets applied to him by a comedian in the play called *Baptæ*, says: "You (*baptēs, baptō*, root of *baptizo*,) bespatted [or aspersed] me with [the abusive epithets in] your play but I, baptizing thee (*baptizo*) [as] with waves of the sea, will destroy thee with streams more bitter."

5. Demosthenes, born B. C. 385, referring to the relative abusive powers of Philip and his enemies, the orator says: "Not the speakers, for they know how to baptize with this fellow;" they can match him in foul words or fierce abuse.

We have enough now to make a pause. My worthy and distinguished brother has risked everything on the primary meaning of *baptizo*; and immerse, he claims, is its primary meaning. But take the lexicons. Carson, Booth and others, failing to find support for their theory from the lexicons, reject them. I accept the lexicons. Their laws of philology, however, I do not accept. But we take their meanings and show that these are explained by those passages in the classics that give these meanings. Now, my brother gives a law of language, that anything or person, to be sprinkled, must be scattered in drops. If so, then the idea is, that in Hebrew, to be sprinkled means to be scattered in drops. Now, let us see how this canon of criticism will work. I take the fifty-first Psalm, ninth verse: "Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean." In the Syriac, Greek and Latin, *rusi, ranteis me, asperges me*—it is sprinkle me, etc. Scatter me in drops? No, no. I could give you quotations in Greek and Latin in

which, though water is the element and sprinkling the mode, yet the person or object affected by it is said to be sprinkled. In Plutarch, the priests commanded the people entering the temple *rantidzein seautous*—to sprinkle themselves.

There are many words meaning to sprinkle, some of which mean in Hebrew, Greek, etc., to scatter, disperse; never moisten, wet, stain. *Many* others *never* mean scatter, disperse, but from sprinkle (of liquids) mean to moisten, wet, bedew, stain, color, *all which take the direct accusative and no intervening preposition, such as upon, on, etc., and such is baptō and baptidzo.*

So, Heb. ix. 19, 21: Moses sprinkled the book, the people, the tabernacle, and the vessels of the ministry. Did he scatter them in drops? In all languages, many, *very many* words occur meaning sprinkle that mean to moisten, wet, color, dip, immerse—all taking the accusative as the direct object of the verb, which forever destroys the Doctor's position.

Now notice what my worthy brother has said about our English version of the New Testament. He seems to think that the translators have not done justice to the immersionist idea involved in the Greek particle *en*; that, in fact, they have allowed their predilection for sprinkling as the mode of baptism to control them in rendering that term into English, as they have done, by *with*. The Doctor claims that *en* means *in*. Well, I admit that this is its more general meaning when used of a *local* relation, but it is not so in *any* of these cases; but does it not also mean *with*? Can these translators be supposed to have been opposed to immersion, when they had all of them been baptized by dipping? Luther, in his German translation of the New Testament, renders *en* by *mit*, with. So a large number of versions have done, as well as six other English versions.

6. We have given you every occurrence of the word down to this period. The next who uses it is the great Stagirite, Aristotle, and, in a literal sense, I am glad to say, and hence we pause on these metaphorical uses of *baptizo* in the classics.

Shakespeare, Bunyan, and the mass of people use the following terms in the connections above: "Those haughty

words of her's bespattered me," etc. Bunyan, "foul aspersion." A. Campbell and Rice, "foul aspersion." Debate, 645 So Dryden, W. Scott. We use "base aspersion," "foul aspersion," for such abuse. But aspersion is sprinkling, means to sprinkle. Pindar and the ancients used the word sprinkle also for praising, at times: "sprinkle with eulogies."

A striking case occurs in Atheneus, a later Greek:

"You seem to me, O guests, to be strangely flooded (*katanhlethas*) with vehement words, while also waiting to be baptized (*hebaptisthai*), flooded (or drenched) with undiluted wine."

Notice here, first: *katanleo* meaning to flood, and played upon by the wit as of a like sense with baptize; waiting to be baptized with wine, you are busy. He does not repeat baptize, but a word of same force there, *katanleo*, flooded, overwhelmed; overwhelming others with words, some would prefer; waiting to be so with wine. But the word here rendered by Conant, the Baptist, "flooded," used in same sense with *baptizo*, primarily means to sprinkle, to pour. This no one will deny, we presume. This gives us another illustration of philology as well as of the word's meaning.

As yet now, first, *baptizo* never yet means to immerse, etc. Second, it implies affusion; was based upon that idea in its metaphorical uses every time, save in Plato. In him, once it is based on that evidently, in the other two cases it is to be drunk. But in Hebrew, Arabic, Latin, etc., words primarily meaning to moisten, when it is by tears, rain, dew, to sprinkle, etc., we saw come to mean to get or make drunk; not words primarily meaning to immerse. Hence, these two uses point to sprinkle as the primary meaning.

Let us now see in what sense Aristotle, born B. C. 380 years, the most learned Greek that ever lived, used it. He, too, used it only once in all his voluminous works. He tells us of "certain places full of rushes and seaweed which, when it is ebb-tide, are not baptized (*mae baptidzesthai*), overflowed, but at full tide are overflowed (*katakludzesthai*)."

As A. Campbell and M. Stuart tell us, these two words are used in precisely the same sense here.

We have, then, the most important data possible here given by the most profound thinkers and scholars of the world. We have,

1. The first literal occurrence of *baptizo* in the world.
2. It does not here mean to immerse, or dip, or plunge.
3. It is the application of the element, the baptizing element, to the stationary, immovable object baptized.

But in that other word, *katakludzo*, equivalent to *baptizo*, we have philological light. It is compounded of *kata*, a preposition. Another later Greek uses *perikludzo*, also, to express the act of classic baptism. So, let us look at it closely. Primarily, *kludzo* means to bedash, besprinkle, or insprinkle with water, implying more or less of force. Our word clyster is the noun from it. Budaeus, Stephanus, and the Glosses, all give sprinkle for *perikludzo*; thus *periklusmati. aspergine*, verb; *aspergo, perfundo*. See Stephanus.

Passow : wash, bedash, wet, etc. [See first reply.]

We see here, then, that the way by which a word that primarily applies to inspersions, aspersions, comes to mean all that *baptizo* does.

Thus, you see, there is no meaning in *baptizo* but that is promptly, easily and scientifically explained, illustrated over and again on this basis. But start with immerse, and not a point in it can be explained by any rule or law that will stand the test. Then, the great facts, the essential facts, of its meanings cannot be explained at all.

1. You have to travel centuries down before you arrive at a literal meaning at all.

2. When you come to that it is against you.

3. You then have to travel on till you reach Polybius, Plutarch, Josephus, etc., to mean immerse.

4. Then you have a body of meanings in those writers and others that show immerse could not have been its earlier or primary meaning. It now means beside, sprinkle, pour, wash, intoxicate, overflow, overwhelm, immerse.

1. But wash is older than immerse, as a meaning of *baptizo*,

by over a century or so. Hence, wash is not derived from immerse, as a meaning of *baptizo*.

2. No word on earth primarily meaning to immerse means to wash. But *baptizo* does come to mean to wash. Hence, immerse never was its primary meaning.

3. *Baptizo* means, derivatively, to overflow. No word primarily and properly meaning to immerse, ever means to overflow. Therefore *baptizo* never meant, primarily, to immerse.

But words primarily meaning to sprinkle, vast numbers of them, do come to mean to overflow, and to wash, to cleanse: and it is the rule, the habitual law of language. Hence, it is certain *baptizo* primarily meant to sprinkle.

So we could apply the other meanings of *baptizo*, but this is enough now.

DR. GRAVES' THIRD SPEECH.

MR. PRESIDENT: We are getting on very pleasantly: we are agreeing. He is just yielding to my position. He admits that the primary meaning of *en* is *in*, and of *eis*, *into*. His lexicons all confirm this meaning. It is not a question as to whether lexicographers be mistaken about the primary meaning of this or that term; this is not a question to be discussed at all. He is a day or two ahead of time. Instead of following me, he is leading. He takes a stretch first in this direction and then in that, just like the hunted fox, whose instincts prompt him to a like expedient as a trick for putting his pursuers off his track. I don't say my opponent is a fox, but only that in this particular, he is certainly following out the fox's tactics. Now I want to call your attention to the very novel and ingenious method by which my opponent deduces from *baptizo* the meaning, "*to get drunk*." He says that two native Greek lexicographers define "*bapto*" and *baptizo* by "*embrecho*;" but then, according to the most eminent of our lexicographers '*embrecho*' means "*to pour upon*," "*to moisten*," "*to soak*," and "*to get drunk*." Now then, as *baptizo* means *embrecho*, and this again means "*to get drunk*," therefore this is one of the meanings of *baptizo*! According to this method of dealing with language, sad havoc may be made with the meaning of terms, and any sense that a man's interest or caprice may dictate can be put upon them. Is there a man, woman or child here, that does not know what it is *to eat*? Now among the definitions that Webster gives of the word "*to eat*," one is "*to devour*." Now Addison, in speaking of a glutton at a feast, says "he devoured it with his eyes." We all understand the expression, and nobody supposes that to eat means to look earnestly upon an object, but this is the sense in which "*devour*" is here used. Does looking upon an object then, mean to eat it? Most assuredly it does, if Eld. Ditzler's principles of philology are good for anything; for to devour means to look intently, and therefore

I can eat him up in a moment! But is there anything fair and square about such statements and such arguments as these? I hold that they are utterly unworthy of my opponent's scholarship. When we come to it, we will show that all these meanings he calls "primary," are no meanings at all. He has now fairly and squarely to show that the primary meaning of the word *baptidzo* is to sprinkle, or to admit that it is not. This, mark you, is the real issue.

Argument.

Returning to my argument, let us notice the history of the Savior's baptism as given by Matthew:

"I indeed baptize you *in* water," etc., "but He shall baptize you *in* the Holy Spirit and *in* fire." I distinctly claim that *en* should be translated *in* in this verse, in accordance with our rule, because it is its primary meaning, and this sense alone will agree with the *context*, for in verses 5 and 6 it distinctly says the people "were all baptized *in* the river Jordan" by John. Consequently baptized *in* the water of it, and the translators were compelled so to translate it. I read the record of the Savior's baptism. *Mat. iii, 13-17*

How was Christ baptized? He came from Gallilee *to* Jordan, and like all whom John baptized, was baptized in the river Jordan, and "came up," the translators are frank to say, "out of the water." What did John do to him, is claimed by some to be a question. I can but believe that every candid Christian mind has within and for itself decided it already.

But let us examine Mark's record of these transactions. Let us first notice how Mark uses the preposition *en*, and how our translators have translated it. In the first chapter, *en* is used twelve times and translated properly *in*, in every place *except as in Matthew where baptism is referred to*, which would be a palpable contradiction of what he states in the fifth verse of the same chapter, where he explicitly says "were baptized (*en to Jordane, potamo*) *in the river of Jordan.*"

I appeal to every fair minded person and to every child to decide if the translators were not in duty bound to have

translated *en* by its *primary* sense here? "I have baptized you *in* water, but He shall baptize you *in* the Holy Ghost."

I read here again, the history of the baptism of Christ:

"And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John in Jordan. And straightway coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens opened, and the Spirit like a dove descended upon him: and there came a voice from heaven, *saying*, Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And immediately the Spirit driveth Him into the wilderness."—*Mark i, 9-12.*

That He was baptized in the river of Jordan, I can't think any honest man ever doubted, for the Holy Spirit expressly says so—*eis ton Jordanen*. But what act did John perform upon Jesus, is to be determined. Did he sprinkle, or pour, or pop water upon him—for all these have their advocates—or did he immerse or bury him in the river? The record positively forbids the first three, while it admits and positively *demand*s the last *one*.

Let us examine the record that Luke gives of the baptism of John. You can all read the 3d chapter to the 23d verse. The first thing we notice is Luke's use of, *en*. It is found nine times in this chapter, and in every instance our translators have rendered it *in*, by its primary meaning, as they should. Luke does not circumstantially record the baptism of the people or of Jesus; but we learn that the people and Jesus were "baptized" and not the *water*—which is important. And we notice again that the translators translate, *hudati*, and *pneumati*, which are in the dative here, without the preposition *en* expressed, *with* water and *with* the Holy Spirit; thus opening the way to the plausible theory that he put the water *upon* them in some *place* and in some *form*, rather than put the people *into* the water or river, as Matthew and Mark have already told us. But the English reader need not be at a loss, for he knows that the indefinite must be determined by the definite. If Mark expressly tells us that persons were baptized by John *into* the water, and Luke should tell us that he baptized the people, but should not tell us *in what*, we would know from Mark it was *in water*. While every scholar knows that this is the dative of place, or element, and that Luke often uses the dative without a preposition answering to the

question, *wherein?* Which use is recognized by Grammarians, and I will settle the issue here by examples.

1. *Taute te nukte*—in that night. And
2. *Te hemera kleine*—in the same day.—Acts ii, 17, 34, 41.
3. *Te proseuche kai te deasei*—in prayer and supplication.—Acts i, 14. For *en te proseuche*.—Acts ii, 46.
4. They continued steadfast, *dedaske*, in the doctrine of the Apostles, etc.
5. *Emmenien te pistei*—to continue in the faith. For *en te pistei*, see Romans iv, 20.
6. Walking in fear—*te phobo*, for *en*, etc.—Acts ix, 31. See 1st Pet. iv, 3.
7. *Zeon te pneumatī*, fervent in spirit. Acts xviii, 25. See 1st Cor. xiv, 20.
8. *Te idia dialekte lalounten*—speak in his own language. Acts ii, 6-8.
9. *Poreuenthai tais hodois autin*—to walk in their own ways.

In all these utterances we have the dative of place like *hudati*, without the *en*, and they each answer to the question *wherein?* Ans. in the way, *en* the water. Matthiæ says: The dative without the preposition *en*, is used in definitions of place in answer to the questions “wherein?” and “when?”

We will examine John, the last witness. Let us also notice how *he* uses the preposition “*en*,” and how faithfully our translators have rendered it. Will you open and read the first 33 verses of the first chapter of John. Here we find *en* used seven times in these 33 verses, and in every place it is translated *in* except the two where it is followed by water! How is this? Can Elder Ditzler tell?

The Evangelist introduces the Harbinger as setting forth his own mission in his own words. In doing so, the latter declares as plainly as any Greek that ever lived could have declared—he declares it as plainly as any living scholar can to-day affirm it in Greek—that he was sent to baptize “*in* (not *with*) water.” And he hence declares as explicitly and with the very words a Greek would have been compelled to use to say it, that he did baptize “in water,” “*en hudati*.” And yet, in every instance where baptism is referred to, they translate “*en*” with water!

The honest scholarship of the world has protested against it, and I am gratified to learn that the English and American Commission of scholars now engaged in making a new version, have translated *en hudati* in all these passages, in water—the English agreeing to place it in the margin, as the literal meaning, while the Americans want it in the text. The rest of this Evangelist's record that refers to John, will be found in chap. iii, 22–24. The important statement bearing upon these questions is the 23d verse. “And John was also baptizing in Enon near to Salim, *because* there was much water there, and they (the people) came and were baptized,”—not sprinkled or poured or popped upon!

We have another important fact stated, *i. e.*, that John, when he removed from Beth-ab-a-ra, the ford-house at the ford of the Jordan, perhaps, as some say, because the water had become too shallow,* went to Enon to baptize, *because* there was *much water* there, (*polla hudata*) deep water, as opposed to *olliga hudata*—shallow water. Why did he go there? Not to sprinkle, not to moisten or to pour, etc., beyond the possibility of a doubt or cavil. He needed much or deep water to baptize *in*—not *with*.

But John did not leave us in doubt as to the action he performed for baptism, though the translators seemed disposed to. He tells us that he performed the same act upon his subjects, as to the river Jordan, that Christ will upon the finally impenitent, as to the lake of fire. He mentions three baptisms, and describes them in precisely the same words; consequently, the common reader rightly concludes the action or the effect in the three cases must be the same. He says: “I baptize (*en*) *in water*. He will baptize you (*en*) *in the Holy Spirit*, and he will baptize you (some of you) *in fire*.” John's own explanation of this, clearly, to our minds, fixes the *baptism of fire* to be “the unquenchable fire” into which John said the chaff and the barren trees would be ultimately cast, for he, Christ, was to burn them up and cast into fire. This is the undoubted paraphrase: “I am baptizing some of you in this river, but there are two other baptisms, one of which

* Smith's Bible Dictionary.

the Coming One will administer to all who hear me. He will baptize some of you in the blessed influences of his Holy Spirit, and some of you—those who reject him—he will cast into the everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.” Now the baptism in fire, will unquestionably be an immersion. Therefore both, the baptism in the Holy Spirit and in water, were immersions. This conclusion cannot be resisted by the human mind, whatever seeming objections may be alleged. Thus John answers our questions.

But Christ explained the action of his own baptism, when he demanded it at the hands of John, and then and there forever fixed its *design*. He had appointed baptism to be *into* repentance, and also *into* the remission of sins. It was from these very facts a *declarative* rite, while it was designed to be a declaration of this, it was also designed to symbolize *how* these were to be procured for his people. To procure the remission of sins for His people, *i. e.*, to redeem them from the penalty of their transgressions, and so bring in an everlasting righteousness for them, was the object of his incarnation. The angel said: “His name shall be called Jesus because he shall save his people from their sins.” His whole work on earth had reference to the remission of sins. He had taken our sins upon him. “He made Himself to be sin for us.” As a sin-laden sacrifice he came to John that he might symbolize before the eyes of angels and men, the great acts he must undergo for the remission of the sins of his people, and secure for them that “all righteousness” they must have to appear before the Father in peace and joy. He came to *picture* by this rite what He must undergo to secure this righteousness—to fulfill *figuratively*—the reality that He must undergo upon the Cross and at the Sepulchre.

Christ’s baptism differs from our own in this, his was a prophecy, a fore-showing, ours is a pointing back, a memorial of that righteousness which Christ fulfilled for us, and on which we rely for “remission of sins,”—the ultimate abolishment and removal of their penalty, for we are all still suffering the penalty of sin. Christ could not thus have fulfilled all righteousness—figuratively—could not have rep-

resented the three facts of his Gospel, in his baptism, without going down into the water, 'being overwhelmed by it and rising again out of it, and therefore his baptism must have been an immersion in water. If so, there can be no Christian or Scriptural baptism without a *burial*, a planting in the likeness of the resurrection of Christ. Primitive Christians were therefore said to have died with Christ, to have been buried with Christ and to have risen with Christ; and all this they symbolized in their baptism, as we *should* in *ours* and *must* if we would be *baptized* with Christ.

These three facts constitute the rocky basis of the whole Gospel of remission. Paul thus taught the Corinthians:

"Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the Gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand; by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures: and that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve."—1 Cor. xv, 1-5.

Christ shadowed forth his death when he sank under the waters of his baptism and was buried! "And that he rose again"—his emergence from that grave of water was the likeness and prophecy of his own resurrection from the tomb of Joseph, for the justification of all who believe on him. He satisfied the penalty of the law for them all, and now as Prince and Savior, can give both repentance and remission of sins to Israel.—[*Time out.*]

DR. DITZLER'S THIRD REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—In my last speech, as the President's hammer fell, I was remarking upon the translators of James' version, and the way in which they had performed their task. There was no possibility of bias in their work. They were immersionists. They were opposed to affusion. Let us test the matter.

1. A. Campbell's Christian Baptism, 140 :

"The translators of the common version were all, or nearly all, genuine Episcopalians, and, at the time they made the version, were accustomed to use a liturgy, which made it the minister's duty, in the sacrament of baptism, to take the child and dip it in the water contained in the font. I have seen copies of James' version, printed in 1611, which contain the Psalms and service of the church, in which frequent allusions are made *to immersion, all indicative of the fact that it was then regarded as the primitive and proper baptism*; consequently, these translators accepted the king's appointment and restrictions, to retain baptize and baptism rather than translate them, and *on no occasion favored the innovation of sprinkling, by ANY RENDERING, or note marginal in that translation.*"

Every word of this is true.

Summing all up, Wall agrees that they did not carry "the practice against the rubric" till Dr. WHITTAKER gave his powerful influence that way," 1624. Wall, ii, 581, *note*. After this, affusion began to prevail, long after James' version was *completed*. Dr. Conant, 138-9, (Statutes of Eng., 1662) sustains this. M. Stuart, 152-3, and Introduction by Dr. J. R. Graves, 24, proves A. Campbell's facts to be true.

Tyndale's version, 1526, settles James.

Tyndale was an immersionist, as A. Campbell's Christian Baptism, 140, Conant, Graves, Brents 337, all show by quotations

1. Here, then, Wall, A. Campbell, Conant, Graves, Stuart, all show that James' version was by out and out immersionists.

2. They show that it is based on Tyndale's, whose version was published 1526 by an absolute immersionist, and immersion (dipping) continued to be *practiced* as the mode for one hundred years later, when affusion began to "gradually" come in—*after* 1624, yet so little prevailed as to leave dipping the *legal* ascendant as late as 1662, and so forcible as to compel Wesley, as late as 1736, in a British colony (Ga.) to refuse to baptize a child by affusion without the usual certificate that it was too delicate to be *dipped*.

Hence, it is perfectly evident that not only were they not partial to our side, but that they favored dipping wherever they could, and rendered *en, with* because candor and the facts compelled such a rendering. In this they are sustained by all the best versions of antiquity, Jerome alone excepted, and by all the best modern versions, from 1522 down, and by Beza and a number of Latin versions. Luther, who held the child in his hands and baptized it said: "*Ich taufe euch mit wasser*"—I baptize you *with* water, and so he *always* renders it in his version. So the Italian, French, Lusitanian, etc. The partiality of James' version for dipping is seen in many renderings—of Christ going up "out of the water," where Conant, the Baptist Union version, Anderson, Wilson, all immersionists, are compelled to render it "from the water," *apo* never meaning out of, and *cannot* apply where there was an *emergence* out of the water. They render *wash*, (*rachats*, Greek *lavo*,) *bathed* many times—a medical use of water, to soothe inflamed or heated parts, whereas, all know the wash of the Pentateuch was *purely* for *cleansing* purposes, real or ritual, and *bathe* is a false rendering to cover up the truth.

On *en* let us now be definite and careful.

In a *local* sense *en*, we are willing to admit, quite answers to our *in*, as used by us. But, it is often used where it locally even does not involve the idea of being all in an object. We say a child is in the water, a horse is in the creek, &c, where its body is not at all in the water, much less *under* it.

But it is where *en* indicates INSTRUMENTALITY that we are now concerned. They were baptized *with* water, *with* the Spirit, *with* fire. These were the elements, instrumentalities

by which baptism was affected. Does *en* indicate this in Scripture? We read: "Rule with (*en*) a rod of iron." "Speak (*en*) with tongues." "Descended (*en*) with the voice," etc. "Anoint (*en*) with oil." Now, this will specially show whether I or Dr. G. is right. In Ezekiel xvi, 4, 9: "Then washed I thee *en* with water I anointed thee *en* WITH oil." This form occurs over *forty* times from Ex. xxix. 2, 40, to Num. xxxv. 28; twelve times in one chapter, Num. vii., *en with*, every time. Now, *how* were they anointed? ALWAYS by applying the oil—they poured it on the person, you know. Well, *en* is used constantly to express that fact. "Anoint *with* oil." We are anointed, baptized with the Spirit—it is poured on us. We are baptized *with* water—it is *poured on* us.

Locally, it is thus used: "Get thee hence and hide thyself *en* by the brook Cherith." Often is it so used—we need not multiply cases.

The brother lays much stress upon *eis*, *into* the water, and *ek*, *out of* the water, Acts viii. 38, where Philip baptized the eunuch. It proves nothing, leaves it an open question entirely. Now, *eis* occurs often with *Jordan* itself in the Bible where it does not imply and cannot imply penetration of the water at all, to even *any* extent. So *ek* applies to water, and the Jordan, out of, where no emergence is possible at all. This being the case, all that is said as to John baptizing in [*eis*] Jordan, or the eunuch is nothing. The only point is, why they went to Jordan, and I will give a Scriptural and perfectly satisfactory reason for that—my brother, by *his* theory, never can. That *eis* does not necessarily imply *into*, penetration, etc., we cite a few of many cases to the point:

2 Kings, ii. 6: "For the Lord hath sent me *eis* to Jordan."

1 Kings ii. 8: "Meet me *eis* AT Jordan."

2 Kings, ii. 21: "Went [they] forth *eis* UNTO the spring of the waters."

1 Kings, xviii. 19: "Gather to me all Israel *eis* AT Carmel."

Joshua, iii. 16: "And those that came down *eis* TOWARDS the sea of the plain."

Matt., v. 41: "Receiveth a prophet *eis* IN the name of a prophet."

Is., xxxvi. 2: "The king sent Rabshakeh from Lachish *eis* to Jerusalem." Not INTO it, for the city was not yet captured, "And they remained outside, by the potter's field, and they came out and met them there," v. 3.

Thus, we see, with verbs of motion even, *eis* applied to Jordan, did not *once* put them *into* its waters. Hence, no more does the bare occurrence of *eis once*, Mark i. 5, with baptize as to Jordan or water, imply it. It is simply as often in the Bible Greek used with the force of *epi*, AT. Hence, Christ "Came to John *epi* AT Jordan to be baptized. Matt. iii. 13.

No more does *ek* necessarily imply emergence or passing out of the element water, or the river literally. Exodus, ii. 10.: "For I drew him (*ek*) out of the water." He was in a basket bedaubed with slime, floating on the water—not any water in or over him.

Joshua tells us of the three millions of Hebrews, "They stood still in Jordan," Joshua, iii. 8; the ark passed "into Jordan," iii. 11; the priests "stood firm on DRY GROUND in the midst of Jordan, iii. 17; they took stones "out of the midst of Jordan," x. 3; they passed over "into the midst of Jordan," x. 5, so verses 8 and 10, same facts. Then, from verses 16 to 20 they "came up out of Jordan;" "come, ye up out of Jordan." Five times does such language occur, yet not one was *in* water, not one immersed—there was no emergence. If millions could be said to be in Jordan, come out of Jordan, up out of Jordan, over and again, once it could be said "both Philip and the eunuch went down into the water—came up out of the water," or John baptized in Jordan, at Enon, near Salim, yet no dip occur.

Eis, primarily, does not mean *into*. It meant, as Kuhner, Liddell and Scott, Passow, etc. show, motion or direction *towards*. Motion towards results in arrival *at*; hence, *at*, *to*, *unto*. Motion towards is often for purposes of aid, help; hence, it comes to mean *for*. Often it implies opposition; hence, against—rarely *upon*, *on*. It results in *penetration*; hence, *into*. Its meanings never can be accounted for philologically or scientifically from Dr. G.'s stand-point. It harmonizes perfectly with the position we hold with these great

authorities. Hence we are left to the context, the surrounding *facts* to determine, as in all other words, its proper rendering in each place.

My brother thinks "baptize with fire" means to plunge into hell-fire! I am amazed at such a position. Look at the facts and language:

1. Multitudes came to be baptized. Luke iii. 15-20.

2. John says: "I baptize you with water." No *en* here, at all—simply *hudati*, with water. "He (*Christ*) shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit *and with fire*." Notice THE SAME PARTIES who are baptized (1) with water, (2) then with the Spirit, are (3) the ones baptized with fire.

3. Nowhere is baptize, in all the Bible, applied to being thrown into hell or hell-fire. NEVER!

4. "Now, when all the people [who came to John to BE BAPTIZED—v. 7] WERE baptized"—v. 21. Here, *all* who came—all "the multitude"—*were* baptized. Now, how absurd to say, John assured those he baptized with water—all right—I baptize you with water, Christ shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit, *and then plunge you into hell!!* It is infinitely absurd. The baptism with fire was literally fulfilled on Pentecost. "There appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each one of them." Acts ii. 3. The fire is a symbol of purification, the *real* object of the baptism of the Spirit on people.

We have heard to-day what I never expected to hear, a Baptist admit that Jordan had not water enough in which to immerse. Dr. G. thinks the reason why John left Jordan and went to Enon, on the high lands, was because *the water was getting too shallow* to immerse people! John went to Enon where he says the water was DEEP! What a reason! Where, on earth, did much (*polla*), many springs, come to mean *deep*? On the contrary, the hot season, most likely, was advancing; the valley of the lower Jordan is intensely hot—the lowest spot above water on the globe, hence intensely hot, being about the latitude of Memphis, Tennessee. At first, John baptizes "away beyond Jordan," John x. 40-42. The multitudes learn and come, and it forces him to Jordan for the

purposes of water—**RUNNING** water—for all purposes of cleanliness, drinking, cooking, for animals on which they traveled, to drink, yet have *pure, i. e., RUNNING* water. I'll make all this clear in due time. After the multitude was abating—fewer coming—the fine, cool springs in the high, mountainous regions of Salim, at Enon, furnished plenty of “running water,” for all purposes whatever.

We now come to Romans vi. 3, 4. Dr. Graves insists that Christ wished to symbolize *death*, that is, his own death, by his baptism. Now,

1. Baptism, from its institution by Moses (Exodus xxx. 18-20, Lev. viii. 6), till John's (Matt. iii., Luke iii. 9-20), never did represent death—no such thought in it. Water symbolizes *life*, not *death*.

2. Christ's *death* was on a cross, by crucifixion, and could not be symbolized by a dip, a sudden dipping of the body under “living water.”

3. John tells us what Christ's baptism was for—that suitable occasion might be given for his manifestation to Israel.

4. The text proves it was not literal, water baptism. Let us see what Paul is discoursing about, Rom. vi. 2: “How shall we that **ARE**”—notice the *tense*, present—“**DEAD** to sin live any longer herein. Know ye not, that so many of us as were [or are] baptized [into *what* now, *water*? Is it *that*? Notice carefully,] **INTO JESUS CHRIST**, were [are] baptized **INTO HIS DEATH**.” Here they are not baptized into *water* at all. Water is no where named. It is not a *physical* act—physical baptism. It is purely, entirely a spiritual work, as it is, 2 Cor. iv. 9, 10—same thing exactly—baptized into death—same here as 1 Cor. xii. 13: “By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body,” been all made to “drink into one Spirit,” participate in it, receive it, be baptized with it.

Now, v. 4, the “buried” is the *effect* of the baptism, not the *act*, not the *mode*, but the effect of the previous baptism of the Spirit—its effect is to be “buried”—“therefore—a *conclusion* drawn here—we **ARE** buried *through* **THE** [*dia tou*—the definite article] baptism [of the Spirit] **INTO DEATH**,” not *water*, but *death to sin*. Hence, there is no water baptism alluded to here.

The same thing occurs 2 Cor. iv. 9, 10; "Always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord. Therefore we who live, *are ALWAYS DELIVERED [buried] eis INTO death for Jesus' sake.*"

5. The word bury, used in the Greek, applies to *any* disposal of the dead; where they were embalmed, or burnt on piles of wood, laid upon scaffolds, to waste away, or interred, or put away in caves. There is no *mode* involved in the word. Yet, our opponents get all their capital out of it.

6. This baptism was proof of death to sin—crucifixion with Christ. No church holds water baptism to be such. Hence, we are forced to admit it cannot be water baptism.

The meaning immerse, then, cannot be inferred from the nature or design of the rite, but just the reverse. And its design or symbolism could not have anything to do with the *primary* meaning. *Immerse* is to *sink*—not to rise. That *CAN*-NOT be the design or symbolism of baptism. Nay, the fewest lexicons in the world, and the inferior ones, give bury as a meaning of *baptidzo*; and they not from any law of language, but from a preconceived opinion as to Rom. vi. 4. But *they all* give it as a rare, *metaphorical*, NEVER as a *literal*, meaning of *baptidzo*. But the *primary* is the meaning we are now searching for.

I showed that *dip* is no meaning at all—immerse a rare, and late, Iron Age meaning. That it never meant immerse till 156 years B. C., and rarely so then. That Baptists rendered it immerse only ten times out of sixty-three consecutive occurrences; dip, only eighteen times, out of *four hundred and fifty-seven* (457) counts!!

He thinks we must render *baptidzo* by a word of action in the New Testament. Now, A. Campbell gives it twenty renderings, Conant, fourteen. When we render it "baptize *with* water," we have all the old Latin versions with us, and all ancient versions, like the Coptic, that were near enough of kin to the Greek to make a transfer of the word. Thus, IN EVERY CASE FROM THE DAYS OF CHRIST TILL THE sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, ALL versions that could do it, transferred *baptidzo* just as we do. Why? No other word

CAN just represent it. To sprinkle, to pour, to dip, to immerse, is not necessarily CHRISTIAN baptism. I can dip a pen, immerse a dog, a rock, a cat, sprinkle a floor—are those baptisms in the New Testament sense? Hence, no word of mere *action* can represent the *baptidzo* of the New Testament. While I hold an object under the water *it is immersed*, is it not? I put a man under the water—hold him there—he is immersed. Is he yet baptized? No; he is immersed, he *is not* baptized. I take him out; is he immersed, now? No. Is he baptized? You say he is. Well, he *is* baptized, then, but *not immersed*. Immersion, then, is not baptism—not its equivalent. You see it, feel it, why not act on it, then?

I have now shown that the primary meaning of *baptidzo* is to sprinkle. By my brother's logic and rules from Ernesti, Horne, Stuart, etc., this was the mode and only mode when Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Peter, the Harbinger said: "I indeed baptize with water—he shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire."

More than fifty words, all primarily meaning to sprinkle, or to moisten, wet, bedew, where it is by affusion of liquids, come to mean all that *baptidzo* and *bapto* do, more or less. It is THE LAW of all languages. Words never begin with dip or immerse, and come to mean what all admit *bapto* and *baptidzo* do. Hence, infallibly certain it is that we are correct here. Years ago, we saw that the Baptist law of language involved infinite absurdities, impossibilities; had no foundation in fact, in history, in the laws of language, but just the reverse—did antagonize them all in every particular, as we have already shown.

Acts xi. 15, 16 compared with x. 44, 45, we learn that the Spirit was "poured out on the Gentiles," "fell on them." This calls to Peter's mind *the promise of baptism*. Now, as yet, *baptism* had not been named. But when the Spirit was POURED out on them, it promptly calls to Peter's mind the promise of *baptism*, Acts i. 5, Matt. iii. 11, Mark i. 8, Luke iii. 16. "THEN remembered I the word of the Lord, how that HE said, John indeed baptized *with water*, but YE shall be *baptized with the Holy Spirit*." The *mode* is named, *pour*. It is

called *baptizing with the Spirit*, in contrast with *baptizing with water*. Why is such language used? "I will *pour water* on him that is thirsty. I will *pour my Spirit* upon thy seed," etc., Is. xlv. 3. Here the habit of pouring water in baptizing is made *the ground* of using the same word as to the Spirit. As the water outwardly purifies physical things, symbolizes cleansing, and so most fitly represents the cleansing Spirit operating on us, as also *oil*, ALWAYS poured on the head, or sprinkled on the person also represented the anointing of the Spirit. It is never represented by *dipping*.

In Hebrews ix. 10, we read of "divers baptisms," as the Greek has it, "immersions," in the Baptist Union Bible, A. Campbell, etc. Now, these baptisms were of the tabernacle-service, v. 9. They were *diverse in kind*; not baptisms on different occasions, *many* baptisms, *pollois baptismois*, but *diaphorais*, different in kind. It implies that there are *differences* in these baptisms; they were *different in sort, in kind*, in the *elements*. See the use of *diaphoros*, Deut. xxii. 9, Dan. vii. 19, Rom. xii. 6, different kinds of seed, a beast "diverse from all others;" gifts "diverse," one of one kind, another of another kind. In verses 13, 19, 21. Paul tells us *in what* this diversity consists: People, the book, vessels of the ministry, and the tabernacle; four diverse objects baptized with "blood of bulls and of goats," and the water of separation, in which were ashes of a red heifer, "sprinkling the unclean," and with "blood of calves." Here is a diversity of elements used, with which to baptize them. This could not be said of immersions in water by people. There would be no diversity in those processes to be marked by *diaphoros*, not different in kind, in elements. But he has no reply till to-morrow, we shall hear what he has to say then, and it is fair to wait always and hear both sides.

But Dr. Graves thinks you cannot baptize a person if *baptizo* means to sprinkle, to pour. We have seen enough to know how to value that. He argues that if baptize be to sprinkle, pour, dip, you have to use all those processes before you are baptized. Does he mean that for the intelligent people or for the simple ones? Why all books are full of

words used in different senses, else language would be endless, which use, custom establishes and the context settles and makes easy of comprehension. Conant gives *baptidzo* fourteen renderings, A. Campbell, twenty. Now, by Dr. G.'s rule, you have to make a man drunk, overwhelm him with debts, sink him, drown him, wash him, overwhelm him with wine, imbathe him, etc., before he is baptized! What miserable resorts are these? yet they are the main staple of immersionists before the masses! It is a shame to resort to such things. A generic word may have many species. We travel (generic). How? We may walk a-foot, go on horse, wagon, buggy, stage, steamer, car, etc. Ride on horse, mule, car, etc. The word purify (*kathairo*, *katharidzo*) explains this. You may purify by burning, in fire, by a blow-pipe with fire, by sprinkling blood, water, washing with water, etc. You may cleanse an object by washing, pouring water on it, by pouring or dipping in water, then rubbing, by scraping, etc. So you sprinkle water on one, he is baptized. Pour it on him, he is baptized. You dip one in it, he is baptized. So in classic Greek, you give one wine, he is baptized. To another you put questions, he is baptized. You now pour abuse on him, he is baptized again. You burden one with taxes, he is baptized. Calamities fall upon him, he is baptized again. You asperse him, he is baptized again—classically, each time, but not Scripturally.—[*Time out.*]

DR. GRAVES' FOURTH SPEECH.

MR. PRESIDENT:—I return to my unfinished argument before I reply to the objections of my opponent.

I was showing that Jesus clearly indicated the character of his own and John's baptism. Christ came to John for baptism.

"But John forbade him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? And Jesus answering said unto him, suffer *it to be so* now; for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffered him."

I said that in his baptism, Jesus fulfilled, symbolically, the three great acts by which he wrought out that perfect righteousness demanded by infinite justice. It was by his death, his burial and his resurrection that he wrought out our redemption. This was the great process by which the Redeemer rescued the guilty from the penalty of the law they had dishonored. It was thus he satisfied the demands of infinite justice and set the prisoners at large. If this was not the "all righteousness" which he performed, I would ask my opponent what it was? But the Savior explains beyond a question the *act* he received at the hands of his Harbinger, in Luke xii: 50:

"But I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straightened till it be accomplished."

He compares the overwhelming sufferings he was about to undergo, and for a season *sink under*, and afterwards to *emerge from*, to the baptismal act John administered to him.

Let the Christian mind decide whether those sufferings were slight and trivial. Was he but slightly touched with them; were they but sparsely sprinkled or lightly poured upon Him, as Dr. Ditzler applies water to his subjects, or was He not for a season overwhelmed in them—plunged—in the language of his prophet—into the deep waters of inconceivable calamity, grief and anguish?

We see that he here compares the sufferings that he was to

undergo to a *baptism* such as that he had to receive from the hands of John. And does not the figure exactly correspond with the facts it symbolizes? Was not the Savior overwhelmed with grief and sorrow and suffering? The sprinkling a few drops of water on the face would certainly be a very senseless proceeding, regarded as a method of shadowing forth the Redeemer's overwhelming *sufferings*. It would be to say that Christ was not overwhelmed with sorrow and suffering. It would intimate that they were very slight. But his own declaration, "I have a baptism to be baptized with," is tantamount to a declaration that the baptism he received at the hands of John was by *immersion*. His allusion was obviously to that *overwhelming* suffering he was about to undergo.

But beyond cavil or reasonable objection, the Apostle Paul tells us clearly and specifically :

"Therefore we are *buried* with him *by baptism* into death : that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we should walk in newness of life. For if we have been *planted* together in the *likeness of his death*, we shall be also *in the likeness of his resurrection*."—Rom. vi, 4-5.

Paul here refers to the baptism that Christ himself received at the hands of his Harbinger. Those who have received a like baptism are admonished that they should henceforth walk in newness of life. Their new and spiritual life should present the same contrast to their old natural and carnal life that the life of Christ, when raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, does to his earthly and temporal life. Paul has the same thought and uses similar language in his epistle to the Colossians :

"Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with *him* through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead."—Col. ii, 12.

The Colossians and their brethren at Rome are thus seen to have participated with Christ in his baptism. A common figure is thus seen to have symbolized the death and humiliation of Christ and the spiritual attitude in which his disciples were placed in virtue of this great transaction. As Christ died, so they had died to sin; as Christ is risen from the dead, so they too henceforth walk in newness of life. And all these

several facts, whether relating to Christ or his disciples, are strikingly set forth by baptism. But this, of course, is said on the assumption that the baptism of a believer is an immersion—a burial. And this Paul distinctly declares it to be—"we were *buried* with him *by baptism*." That these passages refer to Christian baptism, all commentators teach. Thus without the assistance of the lexicons, or without troubling ourselves even about the *usus loquendi*, we have found the meaning of Christian baptism. We are clearly instructed that Christ was buried in his baptism. And then John the Baptist and the apostles buried their disciples in baptism. And thus we have the *inspired* definition of baptism without going to heathen authors or to any human authority whatever.

BAPTISM—*To bury, to plant, i. e., cover over out of sight.* These inspired meanings a thousand times outweigh all the authorities he can muster in forty languages.

Now notice, the Holy Spirit says that Christian baptism is a *planting* in the *likeness* of death. But, sir, there is only *one* likeness of death in the universe. My friend here can get a thousand dollars if he will design two likenesses of death. A gentleman of means, some years ago, offered a reward of ten thousand dollars in gold to any artist who would paint two likenesses of death. Could you paint them? It is not the couched form, pale of cheek, the glazed eye, and the death-rattle; it is not the darkened chamber, the soft tread and stifled whispers, however closely associated with the idea these may be. Why many a one has revived with all these sombre tokens around him to attest his dying. Nor is it the dark-plumed hearse drawn by raven steeds, bearing the supposed corpse to the grave—for even from the coffin and the shroud and hearse, has the supposed corpse come forth. There is a case pending in one of the courts of New Orleans, where an undertaker has sued a man for his funeral expenses, and the man declares he was never dead nor buried. While life was suspended, he was confined and hearsed, and while on the way to the cemetery, he revived and beat upon his coffin's lid, arrested the attention of the driver, and was taken to his home; but the sexton demands the pay for his services. But

when we have seen the lifeless form lowered down into the grave to rest silently in the tomb—*this is death*. This alone is that which adequately conveys an idea of *death*. Sprinkling a handful of sand or dust on the face, is not *burying* a man. Standing up a tree and sprinkling a spoonful of sand upon it, is not planting it.

That these passages refer to water baptism, the candid Christian scholarship of all denominations frankly admits and teaches. It is a matter of equal surprise and regret that there are some controversialists who will presume, in the face of God's Word and the united testimony of eighteen centuries, to deny that these passages refer to water baptism. If we have been buried *with* Christ in baptism, then was Christ *buried* by John. There is no possibility of escaping this conclusion, and the Christian mind don't want to escape so palpable and so satisfactory an explanation. "If I suffer with you, you must suffer." "If I die with you, you must die," etc.

Another argument added, would seem a work of supererogation, but there is another, *viz*:

The primary meaning of Baptidzo, as used by all Greek authors, and admitted by all standard Greek Lexicons, is to immerse, and it has no meaning different from or opposed to this.

Thus I have proved that JOHN DID IMMERSE, and immerse ONLY, from the terms "*en*," "*eis*," and "*baptidzo*," as used by the Holy Spirit in recording the language of John, and the baptism of Christ.

Replication.

I do not intend to be turned aside from the way I have laid out for myself. It is my duty to lead on this subject—Elder Ditzler's to follow, not to anticipate me by three or four days. With reference to Rom. vi, 4, my opponent maintains that the baptism there referred to, is spiritual baptism. And then, as he said before, has reference to the action of the Spirit. But I should think that the august founder of the church of my opponent, must be as good authority, on this question, at least with the members of the church he founded, as is my friend himself. Mr. Wesley, if I remember, says that "buried with him by baptism," alludes to the ancient mode of

baptizing by immersion. Now will you say that my friend's opinion is to be received in preference to that of John Wesley himself, the father and founder of my opponent's church?

Now, my friend admits that *en* means *in*, and if so, then it *must* be translated *in*, unless the context absolutely requires that we take some other meaning—which he don't claim. While he admits that *en*, *primarily* means *in*, will he presume to deny that *eis* means into, where it is followed by the accusative which it naturally governs? Will he do it? Sprinkling, too, and not immersion, he claims is the primary meaning of *baptizo*. How does he prove it? Not by his lexicons, but by a process of ratiocination peculiarly *his own*. I suppose every opinion, however in conflict with reason and common sense it may be, is sure to find some wild critic to champion it, and it seems that every civilized land must be inflicted with a crazy critic, and I am afraid that my friend Ditzler is getting a little dazed to emulate the eccentricity of the Scotch doctor. Germany once had such a man, and his name was Furst. He was known as the "wild" or "crazy" critic, and the strange principles of philology you have heard from my opponent were conceived in Furst's brain—that the primary meaning of a term is the first meaning ever given to it—or, as Elder Ditzler calls it, the *historical* primary! But what have we to do with the probable *first* meaning of the term *baptizo*. We want the meaning that was current and literal, when Christ used it. It seems that every country has had, or has its "crazy" critic. Scotland, a few years ago, had one in the person of Mr. Ewing (Presbyterian). He felt it incumbent upon him to serve his church by ridding *baptizo* of the idea of immersion. He affirmed that there was a relation between "*bapto*" and the English word "*pop*." By the aid of his philological chemistry the *b* of *bapto* was converted into *p*, and *a* into *o*, while at the same time the *to* became sublimated; thus leaving in his critical retort, after the labored process was over, the word *pop*—and so *poptizo* to *pop*—is the sense of the term! To such fanciful and puerile results does the mimetic theory of language conduct. America has its "crazy" hobby-rider in the person of Dr. Dale, who can demonstrate that the real

meaning of *baptidzo* invariably indicates *intus* position (to place within), and yet by his philological chemistry, it means only to sprinkle a few drops of water upon the subject! My opponent, I hear, has recently smashed the pretty hobby-horse of his Bro. Dale, ambitious to have the whole field to himself and his newly constructed philological pony. I affectionately warn him of their untimely end. He should cultivate in himself a higher ambition than to

“Shine to delude, and to dazzle, then expire.”

I am really afraid that my friend has the ambition of becoming the crazy man of the Methodist Episcopal body of America. Now touching his queer etymological fancies, I am told that his people are wonderfully taken with them. He claims that the primary meaning of a term is the *first signification historically* attaching to it! Who ever thought of such a thing before? Why grant, in the case of *baptidzo*, that three thousand years ago it did mean sprinkle, is there any such significancy in that fact as can claim to modify or change the meaning of a document written two thousand years ago, in which the same word occurs after having undergone a change of signification quite diverse from its original import? Certainly no jurist would admit such a change in the case of a legal document. Now, what was the meaning of our English word *prevent*, say three centuries back? Why it had precisely that meaning which its etymology would seem literally to convey—to go before—from the Latin *pre*, before, and *venio*, to come. I will give brief examples from the Old and New Testaments, of their use of the term in this sense, as this will serve to make more palpable the point I am insisting on:

“I *prevented* the dawning of the morning and cried [unto thee]: Mine eyes *prevent* the night watches, that I might meditate in thy word.”—Psalm cxix, 147–8.

“They that received tribute money came to Peter and said: Doth not your master pay tribute? He said, yes. And when he was come into the house, Jesus *prevented* him, saying: What thinkest thou, Simon? of whom do the kings of the earth take custom or tribute?” etc.—Matthew xvii, 24–25.

“We who are alive and remain, shall not *prevent* them who are asleep.”—1 Thes. iv, 15.

The Psalmist simply means that he awoke and prayed to

God before the dawn, and not that he kept the dawn from coming; and the same with regard to the "night watches;" he anticipated them, and would not wait for them before reading and meditating on God's word. In like manner, Christ considerably *anticipated* Simon, so as to relieve him of that embarrassment which he knew his reluctance to introduce the subject of the tribute would produce, seeing that he knew his Master had no money on hand with which to pay it. And Paul taught that the living would not go before the dead, in the first resurrection. Now just think of a jurist who should assume to deal with one of our statutes in this fashion and deny that anything was forbidden or interdicted by this word *prevent*, and then proceed to make good his position by showing that according to its "primary" meaning, the word had no such force! Would not the court rule him a miserable trifler and commit him for contempt? If it would maintain its own dignity and the integrity of the law, it certainly ought. Once admit such a principle of interpreting language as this, and science and jurisprudence must forthwith become subverted, and confusion worse confounded, play havoc everywhere.

Well, I say then, I have to do with *baptidzo* as it was used by Christ and the inspired writers of the New Testament; and I unhesitatingly affirm, that when they used it, its primary—that is, its common and prevailing meaning—was to *immerse* or *dip*. But he has seen fit to anticipate me by two or three days, and I am afraid you will find him as far in the rear when I reach his present positions.

We have to do with *baptidzo* as it was used by Christ and his apostles. We claim that the only point to be determined in regard to it is, its *commonly accepted meaning in their time*. Now he admits that in the time of Polybius, two hundred and fifty years before the Christian era, and in the time of Josephus, eighty years after it, its meaning was *immerse*. That is all we want. He concedes that Polybius and Josephus both use it in the sense of *immerse*. I say then, granting his unsubstantial fancy about its meaning, it makes nothing in favor of his theory of aspersion, and in no degree militates against mine. Indeed, so far as it affects the question in debate, it concedes

everything. For if it had the meaning of *immerse* when the New Testament was written, it must have been employed in that sense by the inspired penmen themselves, and, of course, still retains that sense in our Bibles.

I may be expected to notice his views in regard to Bethabara, away beyond Jordan. I should be pleased to know what interpretation he puts upon the narrative of the Evangelist, when he tells us that

“These things were done in Bethabara, beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing.”

If it was a thousand miles, “more or less,” as the lawyers say, *beyond* Jordan, how does this comport with the fact that John was baptizing *at* the Jordan? I ask him to deny that Bethabara was a common, well-known ford of the Jordan. Why he has a brother in Texas, one of the lights of Methodism in that State, who has discovered that the river Jordan, where John baptized, was no river at all, but a *town* in the south of Judea, bordering on the wilderness! Now positions so groundless and untenable as these, would certainly not be resorted to, except to give plausibility to an unscriptural rite. That it should stand in need of them, is the best proof that it has no more substantial ground to rest upon.—[*Time out.*]

DR. DITZLER'S FOURTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—I must confess that the Doctor takes us by surprise. I never expected to live to see the day when a *Baptist* would dry up Jordan. It is news indeed, to learn that Jordan ran so low, in the lower Jordan, as to be too shallow for an immersion of the human body.

But he falls back on *Bethabara* as the place that John (x, 40-42) says was "away beyond Jordan," into which Christ went, where he abode, and at which place people met and "believed on him there." Bethabara the house of the ford. Unfortunately for the position, his own Baptist Bible, Alex. Campbell, Anderson, Wilson—all immersionists; all ancient Bibles—Greek, Syriac, Latin and Ethiopic, have it *Bethany*. Origen could not find Bethany near enough Jordan to suit him, and erased it from the text, and *substituted Bethabara*, because he could find it on Jordan. We do not recognize Origen's right to change our Bibles. No ancient copy reads Bethabara—all read Bethany. At first, then, before multitudes came, John baptized "away beyond the Jordan." Later, when crowds came, much water was needed for all purposes to which it is appropriated by people, and the Bible required "*running water*," and hence John went to Jordan. The great crowds abating, the fine springs or fountains of Enon, in high, healthy regions furnished enough water now for all purposes whatever. We will recur to this in due time and sustain *our reasons* for John's places of baptism by Scripture. Dr. Graves, seeing the desperate situation of his cause, resorts to the very doubtful expediency of fiercely assailing and trying to belittle the highest authority in the world. Furst is crazy—Ewing is wild. Ewing does not define *baptizo* by the silly definition of *pop.* in his lexicon at all, but in a separate work he proposes that, on the same score, that immersionists do essentially, as to its *root*. It is absurd, of course, and has no part in our debate. As for the great Jewish immersionist, Rabbi Furst,

he has produced the best Hebrew lexicon, the best Hebrew concordance and lexicon, that ever have been given to the world. As a Rabbi, he was an immersionist—for Jews immerse all Gentiles now, just as Rabbi Wise is an immersionist. As to the report that he is “a crazy critic,” *that* is all in Dr. Graves’ imagination. I keep about as well posted as most men on German critics, and never have I heard or read of such a thing. We demand the PAPERS for it. Immersionists may regard him as wild and crazy, just as such people did Franklin, Morse, Fulton, Copernicus, Newton, Jenner. The first cases of vaccination started the Dr. Graves class of people into a dreadful frenzy. To use vaccine matter would make men animals. Nay, it was reported some already chewed the cud, and others felt horns sprouting on their heads. Had Dr. G. been there, they would have shot out finely on his, no doubt. No, sir, when such critics as Kitto, Davidson, Smith, etc., hold Furst as first among lexicographers in Hebrew, and he has (died recently) the professorship of Oriental languages in the most renowned university for such studies on the globe—Leipsic, such attacks fall harmlessly to the ground.

Dr. Graves now thinks that I want to get him away from the Bible argument! Was not his whole morning’s speech about philology, canons of authority, interpretation and matters wholly outside the Bible? Did he not quote laws from Ernesti, M. Stuart and Blackstone, from Horne and others? Then did he not bring forward three human authorities, a Baptist, a Presbyterian—Geo. Campbell, and a Lutheran—Bretschneider, I believe? Did he quote the Bible? Did he offer a Bible argument? Did not all he adduced point to a philological argument, to be conducted by scientific methods, or philological principles? He did. Now when I pursue exactly the course laid out by him, and it is perfectly evident my facts cannot be met, he flies precipitately to Jordan, entrenches himself behind Ebron, and already hides in “buried with him through baptism unto death!” He told us of the strong words of Elder Wilkes in the Louisville Debate 411, that not for a day and a half would the common people understand him, yet, at the end of Dr. G’s hour, how many could see his aim?

The Doctor thinks that the "righteousness" Christ fulfilled at his baptism, was symbolic of his sufferings which he was sure to endure on the cross; but Dr. G. claims that the baptism administered by John, was Christian baptism. If so, its import is always the same—has the same object, aim, purpose *to whomsoever administered*. If in the case of Christ, it was symbolic of his death and burial, and foreshadowed his sufferings, then the baptism of his disciples must have had the same signification. But no, we are told *their* baptism symbolized their death unto sin. In this instance, then, Christ's baptism could have had nothing in common with that of his disciples. He never knew sin. John's baptism was unto repentance. Did it betoken that to Christ? or symbolize regeneration?

Christian baptism symbolizes regeneration—the purification of our polluted natures. If Christ's baptism was to represent to us its import that we fulfill all righteousness, it goes too far you see, in all these points. In this and *all other* points, Christ's baptism had nothing in common with ours in import, in design.

But Dr. G. restricts the meaning of what the Savior did in his baptism to a foreshadowing of his own death, burial and sufferings. But Christ's main sufferings were on the cross. How could a dip under clear, pure water, symbolize, from your stand-point, the crucifixion? Where is the point of analogy? Up till then, for fifteen hundred years, never had water baptism symbolized death, burial, crucifixion or any such thing. No such fact can be adduced. Hence it would have utterly failed in import. No apostle or disciple, or Jew so understood it. Christ said no sign should be given of his resurrection save that of Jonah.

But he asks: "Could a little water sprinkled or poured on the head, represent the sufferings and burial of Christ—his death?" We reply: In Matthew xxvi, 9–12, the woman poured oil on his head, and he said: "In that she hath poured this ointment on *my body*, she did it (*pros*) in respect, in reference to my burial." A little oil poured on his head symbolized literally—"the burying of me"—my being buried. As to his

death, *a sip of wine* memorializes all that. A bit of bread symbolizes the breaking of his body. Quantity is not involved in the symbolic element or a corresponding modal act at all.

Dr. G. says the learning of the world is with him, that Rom. vi, 4, "buried by baptism into death" refers to water baptism. We answer, Beza, M. Stuart, Hodge, to go no further, all hold, in their commentaries, etc., that it *does not* so refer. The context shows it does not so refer. The world being divided, we are left to examine it critically and decide by the facts involved, which show clearly that it does not so refer. Wesley, Clarke and the great body of those who hold it as so referring, held that it was Jewish Proselyte baptism to which Paul referred. As the Jewish writers in the fourth and sixth centuries spoke on it, they were misled by their later style of treating it. All Baptists reject the opinion, and hold that it was not practiced in or before apostolic times, and hence not referred to by Paul. In rejecting the opinion on which Wesley, Clarke, etc., based their comment, they destroy this testimony, and thus it all falls, and leaves in full force the testimony of the other class of commentators with whom we hold. As to "planted" with him—trees, shrubs, etc., are planted, not *buried*, it involves not envelopment. Seed are sown—sprinkled—"cast your seed corn—bread corn—upon the waters."

We have shown by an appeal to all standard Greek lexicons; by an appeal to the ablest immersionist authors; by an appeal to the classic Greek writers themselves, that *baptidzo* did not mean to immerse—that it never was applied to the act of immersion—till in Polybius, and subsequent Greeks of the iron age of Greek. They cannot find—they *never will* find—an example previous to that age in which it meant immerse. It also means to make drunk, overflow, overwhelm, drench, as well as immerse; and there would be as much propriety in restricting its New Testament use to "make drunk" as its meaning, as to fall upon any other single classic meaning, if you are to go by the Doctor's rules.

As to *eis*, it primarily implies direction towards. (See Lid-

dell & Scott, Passow, Kuhner, etc.) I have shown that *eis* as often means *at, to, in, unto, for, as into*. Its precise meaning, therefore, in any given case, must be determined by the context where its relation to each word is indicated by the surroundings of the word. To insist, therefore, that in every case its meaning is *into*, is just as much unscientific as to claim that *baptidzo* always and everywhere means to immerse.

"But what does all this amount to," Dr. G. asks? It is well enough to decry the character of an argument that one feels himself unable to answer. But heretofore their greatest and most distinguished authors, such as Cox, Gale, Conant, Ripley, A. Campbell, Wilkes, Judd, J. R. Graves, have always pursued the philological argument as their chief and almost their only dependence. Dr. Graves quotes from Judd, from Michaelis, from Castel, Buxtorff, Beza; and all of them, when they are before their own people, rely on the philological argument. But now, when we come to confront them, they tell us that all our talk about philology, is a matter of empty parade and a vain display! Let them then pour the phials of their wrath on their own Carsons, their Conants, Judds and Graves, Gale, etc., etc., for we know that all these distinguished authorities had relied on the philological arguments in defense of their distinctive views. But I am not dependent upon languages on this question. It is a plain matter of fact. But these arguments have been made by our opponents, and great stress laid upon them. These things are well known, and we now have these great authorities before us, and it certainly, therefore, is incumbent on us to quote them, and to meet the bold assertions, so often made. When quotations are made from Blackstone, and from Stuart, Ernesti, etc., as to the principles on which language is to be interpreted, we suppose it means something. But it is not that they are opposed to philology; for so long as they see a chance of pressing it into their own service, they are great on philology, and only discredit it as an essential element in this controversy, when they see that it cannot be made subservient to their own sectarian purposes.

It seems our immersion friends are now wild over Rabbi

Furst, the great Jewish lexicographer. But let us see if he is essentially alone, or well supported. *Tabhal* is the Hebrew for baptize. It is translated both *bapto* and *baptidzo* in the Septuagint used by the Apostles. The Targums, Versions by Jews into Chaldee, translate *tabhal* by *rachats*, *wash*, also. Let us now examine the lexicons on *tabhal*. We pass by the little manuals that are purely abridgments and inferior, save one, Stokius. As he has been held up so confidently by immersionists, we cite him as a manual.

1. *Schindler*, 1612 Pentaglotton folio. *Tabhal*, to moisten, dip, immerse—thus, to wash, as the object is not to be cleansed, but MERELY TOUCHES (*attingat humorem vel tota, vel ex parte, baptizavit*) the liquid, [for it applies to *any* liquid] in whole or in part, to baptize.”

2. *Stokius*—moisten, dip, immerse, &c. So it touches the liquid in whole (*aut saltem ex parte*) or merely in part.”

3. *Leigh's Critica Sacra*—same as rest—then—“but it merely touches the liquid (*tantum attingat*) either in whole or in part [partly], to baptize.”

4. *Buxtorff's Chaldee*, Robbins' &c folio, thirty years' work in it. *Tabhal* “moisten, dip, &c,” same as rest in substance—and the object “is not washed all over, but besprinkled with the water, (*ab aqua*). He shows, too, that in later days immersion of the body occurred.

5. *Castell's Heptaglotton*, 1669. This great work cost immense labor. Really there are over three hundred years of the labor of the greatest scholars and philologists of that century of linguists embraced in this great work. Nineteen of the greatest philologists and linguists of that century were engaged in it. It is therefore equivalent to 19 Lexical authorities. Hear this volume of imposing authority then, on *tabhal*, the equivalent of *baptidzo*. To moisten, dip, immerse, (English dip or dabble) baptize. It differs from *rachats*, because washing is for *cleansing* an object. But the dipping merely touches the object to the liquid in part or wholly—(*Intinctio, autem rem humidam contingat tantum, vel ex parte, vel totam*, Rab. Dav., Gen. xxxvii, 31 verse). Chaldee, *tebal*, same as Hebrew and Rabbinic. To wash one's self, cleanse anything in water. But the

washing is of vessels or men. Later it might be by immersion of the whole body, but not always, (*at non semper.*)

Here now, we have the equivalent of 23 lexicographers, and Kimchi, the classic Jewish lexicographer of the 10th century, making 24 all defining it first, to *moisten*, (*tingo*), then *dip*, and tell us, *all* of them, that it is *such a dip as merely touches*, (*tingo, to touch*), the object baptized, to or with the liquid or water, *in part*, or in whole. *This dip* is not what you want. It *baptizes* if it *merely touches* the object to or (ab aqua) by the liquid or water. Then with this fact, it is immerse *last*, and *nowhere* means immerse in the Bible, but *only* in late Chaldee, and not always so then. Now

6. Furst, the great Jewish Rabbi, Professor of Hebrew in Leipsic, where, above all Universities in the world, Hebrew is most thoroughly taught, the *folio* work defines it:

“To moisten, to wet, to sprinkle, to immerse—*rigare, tingere, perfundere, immergere.*” In his late large *German*, Hebrew and Chaldee lexicon, translated by the learned S. Davidson, one of the most critical scholars of England in this century, it is exactly the same—to moisten, wet—*benetzen* answering to *tingo* in his *Latin*. Sprinkle (*begiessen* answering to his Latin *perfundere*), *rigere, tingere, therefore* to dip, to immerse. That is from *tingere*, moisten or wet, dip, immerse, are *derived* meanings, just as we proved by such a world of facts. He then adds: “The fundamental signification of the stem (*bal*) is to moisten, besprinkle.”

I would be glad now for the Doctor to bring up their favorite Gesenius. I will show him how to support our position also, as he gives the root as equivalent to the Greek *deno* whence comes our *den*, bedew, sprinkle, and though it is all false philology in Gesenius, yet if he adopts him, he is crushed by him from the facts we will adduce from Gesenius. Hence *all* Hebrew learning, lexicography and facts are with us here, and perfectly demolish the Doctor. I want Maimonides of the 12th century, the old Jewish Arab introduced, so often quoted by their side. We are prepared with it in the original. With these proofs, we turn to the Bible, our great store-house both of truth and of facts.

When I was a youth in school, Dr. Graves was a skilled debater. He was in the thickest of the fight when I was a student in college. He is presumed, therefore, to be able to do all that man *can* do here for his cause. We appeal to you all—have we shunned any point—shrank from any issue he has raised? Not one. We have met every point, and at the same time amassed such a weight of evidence for affusion as *the only Scriptural mode*, that it perfectly overshadows all he has adduced, and he has not even made a serious attempt to assail us anywhere. I came prepared to begin with the Bible—plain English argument, but he began with philology—I had to follow and did so.

Hebrews ix, 10, we are told the tabernacle service consisted in “meats and drinks, and (*diaphorais baptismois*), *diverse baptisms*.” Then the Jewish service had baptisms *different in kind*—so the word means, not *pollois* in *many*. The word denotes things different in kind—elements, species different, and is *always* so used in the Bible. Paul tells us in what these diversities consisted in verses 13, 19, 21. With water, with blood of three different kinds of animals, four different sorts of elements besprinkled on four different sorts of objects, the people, book, tabernacle and vessels of the Ministers. Hence on the meaning of *eis*, let us quote :

2 Kings, ii, 6—“For the Lord hath sent me *eis*, to Jordan.”

1 Kings, ii, 8—“Meet me (*eis*) *at* Jordan.”

2 Kings, ii, 21—“Went (they) forth *eis*, *unto* the spring of the waters.”

1 Kings, xviii, 19—“Gather to me all Israel, *eis*, at Carmel.”

Josh. iii, 16—“And those that came drew *eis*, *toward* the sea of the plain.”

Luke v, 4—“Launch the ship *eis*, *into* the deep.” Certainly it went not *under*, but *on* the water ; in it, not submerged.

Luke, xv, 22—“Put a ring *eis*, *on* his hand.”

We have selected cases where *water* was involved ; verbs of motion used, yea, a number where (*eis ton Jordane*) *eis* stood connected with “the Jordan” exactly as in Mark i, 5—“baptize *eis* in or at the Jordan,” the *only* time *eis* connects baptize with anything, such as river, water, &c, in the New Testament. It is now demonstrated that *eis* proves nothing as to mode in Mark i, 5 ; Acts viii, 38. Hence Liddell & Scott’s lexicon, Dr. G’s *favorite*, says of *eis*, its “radical signification is *direction*

towards, motion to, on or into." So Passow, Kuhner and Buttmann.

So much do *eis* and *epi*, *at*, *upon*, *to*, answer to each other in meaning, that in different manuscripts and texts they interchange often.

Nor is *ek*, out of, any help, for Exodus ii, 10, we read: "I drew him (*ek*) out of the water." Yet he was in a basket so prepared as to float *on* the water. "And we departed (*ex*asamen) from the sea." Here are both *ek* and *apo*, yet they were not *in* the sea. In Joshua iv, 16-10, we have "*out of Jordan*" five times repeated. "Come *up out Jordan*," *ek*, where some three millions of people "came up *out of Jordan*," yet not one immersed, but were on "*dry land*." Texts could be multiplied, but this is enough. Nothing is more common than to bid a child to *come out of that water*. What are you doing in that water? where it is only playing in a pan or puddle of water or a branch.

There is no proof at all that Philip immersed the eunuch. It simply leaves the mode an open question to be settled by other facts. There is no proof that John immersed a soul in all his life, but every proof of the fact that he baptized, as always Jews had, by affusion.

How did John baptize? "With water." But the Doctor says *en* is always *in*—equivalent to our *in*. Locally it is often so used. But indicating *instrumentality*, which is its use here, it is *never* so used.

1. In about half the cases of "baptize with water," it is simply *hudati* with water—no *en*, but dative of instrument.

2. The *en* occurs hundreds of times in the Greek of the old and new Testaments, meaning *with* where *instrumentality* was indicated, and *affusion* always the mode. Ezekiel xvi, 4, 9, is an example. In the one case an infant the day it was born is "*washed en* with water. Verse 9, "then washed I thee *en* with water. I anointed the *en* with oil. Anointing *en* with oil occurs forty-one times consecutively in the Pentateuch and mixing with (*en*) oil, where we all know it was always by *pouring*. Yet *en* indicates its use—points out its instrumentality. Is a new born babe dipped under water to be washed? So in

cleansing a house, five times *en* occurs in one verse, where it is cleansed by sprinkling, yet reads *en* with water, *en* with blood and *en* with hyssop, &c. "Rule *en* with a rod of iron." We need not quote a world of texts. The Bible is full of such. Hence John baptized *with* water as an instrument. Christ *with* the spirit, with fire. The water was administered by affusion, *epi*, at Jordan, *eis* at Jordan. Matt. iii, 13; Mark i, 5; *en* at or in Jordan, all within its banks Carson agrees is implied here—may be implied—as a location it was *epi*, *eis*, *en* Jordan, at Bethany, at Enon John baptized, *with* water. Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Peter, Christ, all are witnesses here that it was "with water," "with the spirit." It was poured on them, fell on them, was shed on them. And how absurd for John to say, "I baptize *you* with water. Christ will baptize *you with the Spirit and cast you into hell*," the very ones that received a *double* baptism!! Acts xi, 15, 16. When Peter had seen that the Spirit was poured upon them, he said, "Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, 'John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.'" And on the day of Pentecost they had the fiery element super-added, with which they were baptized in accordance with John's prophetic declaration. But my opponent would strangely construe this as an allusion to the immersion of the impenitent wicked in hell. You see on the day of Pentecost they were baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire. The Holy Ghost descended, and rested on them, and cloven tongues as of fire sat upon each of them. There was no immersion. And if we were inclined to exult over a vanquished opponent, we might assuredly do so now, the Doctor having failed so signally in his attempt to give even plausibility to the position he has laid down. Every thing, moreover, which he has advanced, having the semblance of argument, we have so effectually stripped of its disguise, that, even to his own friends, it can hardly wear the aspect, we should think, of respectable sophistry. And now, in closing these remarks, I cannot but express my ardent desire that each minister of Christ's gospel, as he goes forth to his great work, may henceforth receive more copiously that baptism of the Holy Ghost, to which our thoughts have just now been directed.—[*Time up.*]

DR. GRAVES' FIFTH SPEECH.

MR. PRESIDENT:—My opponent a little misunderstood me. I did not deny that Ewing was a scholar. I did not deny that Dale was a scholar. I willingly concede that these men were scholars. My remarks were not intended to disparage their *scholarship* but to expose the flimsy, unsubstantial character of their wild *philological* fancies.

And then, he is mistaken again on another point. In my speech yesterday, I only referred to lexicons in general terms. I did not spend one moment in discussing *philology*. Nor have I the least objection to these great tomes piled up here to astonish the common people. You know, Mr. President, that I said at the outstart, I was going first to develop the meaning of the word of God on this subject. And I venture to affirm, that there is not a child that has arrived at the years of accountability, but can see that the word of God does itself furnish a clear interpretation of the meaning of *baptizo*, and that *that* meaning is to immerse; and this, observe, is the point we want to arrive at; all outside of that Book is merely incidental to this question. Now I have to say that he will find he cannot get me away from that argument. You Missouri farmers tell your man to go and *plant* corn and he *sprinkles* it on the top of the ground, has he obeyed you? Has he *planted* if he has only dropped it? You tell him to go bury a dead carcass, and he only sprinkles a handful of dirt upon it, has he obeyed you? Is sprinkling a thing covering it over?

One thing I failed to notice yesterday. He referred to Pindar as the first Greek who ever used "*baptizo*," and as having then used it metaphorically. This is a glaring mistake. Pindar, in the example given, used it in a strictly literal sense. There is nothing but *dip* in it. Conant translates the passage thus:

"For as when the rest of the tackle is toiling deep in the sea, I, as a cork above the net, am undipped—*abaptistos*—in the brine."

As all *figures* are founded on *facts*, so the figure employed by the poet here, is founded upon the physical fact of the undipped—not the *unmoistened* or the *unsprinkled*—cork of the fisher's net. There is nothing but dip, in this example, and it is an omen that bodes disaster to his cause, when the very first case he himself selects, overthrows his position!

I expected from Elder Ditzler a stunning assailment of my position in demonstrating the *act* of John's baptism, the act which Christ and his apostles and every member of the first church received, but strange to say, he noticed but a few of them, and these so feebly that I regard it as equivalent to an admission on his part, of their unanswerable force; and the *act* of John's baptism once determined, the *act* which Christ commanded is evidently established by it, for no sane man can be persuaded that Christ did not command his apostles to administer the act which he and they had received at the hands of John. Every Christian will be safe in following the example of Christ.

I propose, in this speech, to defend my eight arguments by additional considerations and by the concurrent testimony of the most distinguished Pedobaptist scholars, and those of his own school. My first argument was—

1. THE PRIMARY AND LITERAL SIGNIFICATION OF THE PREPOSITION “EN” IS “IN.”

If this is sustained or admitted, then must we render *en* by in, in every place in the New Testament where it occurs, unless it is repugnant to the sense of the passage.

PROOF.

1. No Greek scholar will deny that *en* does primarily and literally mean in, and corresponds exactly to our preposition in, and means in, as often as the English preposition *in*, means in.

2. Every Greek lexicon extant gives, in, as the primary meaning of *en*.

3. The *usus loquendi* of the New Testament unquestionably sustains this meaning.

We find *en* used two thousand six hundred and sixty times in the New Testament, and it is translated in, two thousand

and forty-five times, which proves it to be its general, which is its primary meaning. But it is translated by *on*, and by *at* or *with*, three hundred and thirteen times, and by *within*, *among*, *by*, and *because of*, in the remaining places.

Now *any one* can convince himself by an examination, that a majority of these places might be properly translated in, and that in every case, this meaning governs the sense.

ILLUSTRATIONS:

"He spake *by* parables," "love the Lord *with* the heart, soul, mind;" *in* is the sense. "On the feast day," "*on* the Sabbath day;" evidently *in*. "Say not *within* yourselves," "*at* that time;" *in* is the force here. "*Among* themselves," and strange, doubly strange, *en agape* (1 Cor. xvi. 14) "*with* love," when it should be *in* love; as, we should speak the truth *in* love.

I seal what I have to say on *en* with this, that unless *en* means *in*, the Greek had no preposition the primary meaning of which was *invariably* in, which fact will satisfy every Christian and fair-minded person. I quote upon Elder Ditzler, the language of Rev. Jas. Harvey to the father and founder of Elder Ditzler's own church.

"The Rev. Jas. Harvey, addressing the Rev. J. Wesley, says: 'I am ready to grant that places may be found where the preposition *en* must be understood according to your sense; [that is, *with*]; but then every one knows that this is not the native, obvious, literal meaning; rather a meaning swayed, influenced, moulded by the preceding or following word.' He will not allow the Greek preposition *en* to signify *in*; though I can prove it to have been in peaceable possession of this signification for more than two thousand years.'—*Letters to Mr. J. Wesley*, pp. 26-322."

What, therefore, have I a right to conclude, and what is the duty of all to believe? Certainly, that whatever John did to the people or to Christ, denoted by "baptized," he did to them *in* water, and not *with* it; and in the words of the Spirit, he did baptize Christ "*in* the river of Jordan," and not *with* it, or *on* it, or *by* it, and if there is one who can think that John took his subjects *into* the river to *sprinkle* them, I have no argument with that man; *the man don't live that really believes he did*. Let no Baptist henceforth for one moment, admit the reading, *with*, in the Greek.

II. MY ARGUMENT FROM "EIS" IS VERY SIMILAR. THE

PRIMARY, LITERAL AND GENERAL SIGNIFICATION OF "EIS," AS USED BY ALL GREEK WRITERS AND AS GIVEN BY ALL GREEK LEXICONS IS *into*, AND NEVER *with*; AND THE HOLY SPIRIT SAYS *in* AND *into*, NEVER *with*, *at* OR *near to*.

It is used seven hundred and ninety-five times by the four evangelists, and translated three hundred and seventy-two times by *into*; and by *to* for *into*, more than one hundred times; and two hundred and seventy-three times by *unto* in the sense of *into*.

ILLUSTRATIONS:

When he came *to* the house, *to* the city, *to* the temple, *to* Jerusalem, *to* Bethany, *to* Nazareth, *to* Jericho as you say you go to St. Louis; it must be translated *into*, unless the context forbids. The Greeks had no other word whose primary meaning was *invariably into*, as we have none in English save *into*.

Now Mark, by the Holy Spirit, tells us that Jesus came from Nazareth, of Galilee, and was baptized of John—" *eis ton Jordanen*"—*into* Jordan. *No Greek scholar can translate it otherwise.* Whatever John did to Jesus, denoted by the Greek verb *baptidzo*, the *act* put Christ *into* the water of the river Jordan. Is there a man, woman, or child, will the most unprincipled of modern professional controversialists assert, that he sprinkled Christ into the river, or poured him into the river, or as Ewing claimed, popped him into the river.

I dwell at this length upon these two prepositions because I think they conclusively settle the whole question touching the action of baptism when properly translated. I would be perfectly willing to leave it to the impartial verdict of any twelve veracious men, under oath, living in this town or in the State of Missouri. Their force in determining the action of baptism has never been developed, because the translators clearly saw that to translate them literally in every case, in the language of Dr. Beecher, respecting *baptidzo*, they would seem to take sides in the controversy then pending; accordingly, in order to take neither side, they did not attempt to give sense, and used the ambiguous *with*, though in two instances, Mark i, 9, they were compelled to translate it so nearly literally that

the passage settles the action forever. Christ was immersed *into* the river Jordan. These two little prepositions are two hooks of steel that cannot be broken, and whose hold is sure. I claim that they alone settle this question in my favor, that Christ was baptized by immersion, and if Christ, then his apostles and all whom John baptized.

III. THE PLACES JOHN SELECTED FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE RITE ARE DETERMINATIVE OF THE MODE.

They were at the river Jordan, and at Enon, and the Holy Spirit says he was baptizing at Enon *because* there was *much* water there. Nonus says *diophonon hudor*, deep water. He never would have resorted to much water unless for immersing. A pitcherful would have sprinkled a thousand, and a bucketful would have sufficed for all John ever baptized, if he performed the rite as moderns do, by laying a *moistened finger on the forehead*, which is neither sprinkling nor pouring.

"CALVIN.—'From these words (John iii, 23) it may be inferred that baptism was administered, by John and Christ, by plunging the whole body under water.'"

"BP. BOSSUET.—'The baptism of St. John the Baptist, which served for a preparative to that of Jesus Christ, was performed by plunging. The prodigious multitude of people that flocked to his baptism, made St. John the Baptist choose the places about Jordan, and among those places the country of Ænon near to Salim, *because there was much water there*, and a great facility for dipping those who came to consecrate themselves, etc.'"

"DR. TOWERSON.—'For what need would there have been of the Baptist's resorting to great confluxes of water, were it not that the baptism was to be performed by an immersion? A very little water, as we know it doth with us, sufficing for an effusion or sprinkling.' In Booth's Pedobaptim, vol. i, p. 209."

"DR. DODDRIDGE.—'At Ænon, *because there was a great quantity of water there*. It is exceedingly difficult to determine the true situation of this place. * * * But nothing surely can be more evident than that *polla hudata, many waters*, signifies a large quantity of water, it being sometimes used for the Euphrates (Jer. li, 13). Sept. To which, I suppose, there may also be an allusion (Rev. xvii, 1). Compare Eze. xliii, 2; and Rev. i, 15; xiv, 2; xix, 6; where *the voice of many waters* does plainly signify the roaring of a high sea.' In the Paraphrase he writes: 'And John was also at that time baptizing at Ænon, which was a place near Salim, a town on the west side of Jordan; and he particularly chose that place, because there was a great quantity of water there, which made it very convenient for his purpose; and they came from all parts and were baptized by him.'"

"OLSHAUSEN.—'John also was baptizing in the neighborhood, because the water there * * * * afforded convenience for immersion.' Com. on John iii, 22-36."

"DR. W. SMITH.—'There was Ænon, near to Salim, to the north, where St. John was baptizing upon another occasion, "because there was much water there" (iii, 23). This was during the summer, evidently (comp. ii, 13-23) that is, long after the feast of the passover, *and the river had become low*, so that it was necessary to resort to some place *where the water was deeper than at the ordinary fords.*' Bib. Dic. Art; Jordan. (Sig. E. S. Ff.) Subsequently the writer speaks of Ænon, 'where there was not generally so much of a ford, but, on the contrary, where the water was still sufficiently deep, notwithstanding the advanced season.' Under Ænon, we read 'Ænon, a place "near to Salim," at which John baptized. It was evidently west of the Jordan, and abounded in water.'

"DR. MACBRIDE.—'The spot chosen by the Baptist on the banks of the river, and the observation that he baptized at Ænon "because there was much water there," seem to *prove* that he administered it by immersion.' Lec. on the Diat."

I claim this to be a conclusive argument in itself, sufficient to satisfy any reflecting mind. The leading lawyer of the McMinnville bar, during my opponent's debate with Elder Brents, stated, in my hearing, that he had heard the discussion of one question, the mode of baptism, and he declared that the fact that John did resort to the Jordan and to Enon for the purpose of baptizing, conclusively and forever, in his mind, determined the act to have been immersion.

IV IT WAS THE PEOPLE, AND NOT THE WATER, HE *baptized*. BUT HE COULD NEITHER POUR NOR SPRINKLE PEOPLE, BUT HE COULD IMMERSE THEM, THEREFORE NEITHER TO SPRINKLE NOR TO POUR, CAN BE THE DEFINITION OF *baptidzo*.

This is conclusive against sprinkling and pouring at least. John certainly did not perform either of these acts.

V JOHN MENTIONS THREE BAPTISMS: "*En Hudati*," "*En Pneumati Hagio*" AND "*En Puri*." WE KNOW THE ACTION OF EACH MUST HAVE BEEN THE SAME; FOR THEY ARE DESCRIBED BY THE SAME WORDS.

Now, we know the last baptism is to be an immersion *in fire*, for John himself explains it to be in everlasting fire that all the finally impenitent will be immersed or overwhelmed.

"Whose fan is in his hand; and he will thoroughly purge his floor, the

wheat he will gather into his garner, but the chaff he will burn up in unquenchable fire."

I submit a few other passages:

The beast and false prophet "both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone."

Of Satan, it is said the angel "cast him into a bottomless pit."

Again: "Death and hades were cast into the lake of fire, and whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire."

Again: "Cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness, there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

Again: "Depart from me ye cursed into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels."

Therefore John's baptisms, "*en hudati*" and "*en pneumati hagio*," were by immersion also. That this is, beyond controversy, determinative, mark the teachings of the most learned.

"Dr. Robinson's Greek Lexicon of the New Testament, p. 126, 'Metaphysically and in direct allusion to the sacred rite, baptize *en pneumati hagio kai puri*, to baptize in the Holy Ghost and in fire—*i. e.*, to overwhelm, richly furnish with all spiritual gifts; or overwhelm with fire unquenchable. Matt. iii, 11; Luke iii, 16; Mark i, 8; John i, 33. Still in allusion to the rite; to baptize with calamities—*i. e.*, to overwhelm with sufferings.'"

"Dr. George Campbell, of Scotland, says: 'In water, in the Holy Spirit.' The word baptism, both in sacred authors and classical, signifies to dip, plunge, immerse. It is always construed suitably to this meaning.' *Notes on New Testament, Andover*, vol. ii, p. 20."—[*Time out.*]

DR. DITZLER'S FIFTH SPEECH.

GENTMEMEN MODERATORS:—In regard to the correct translation of *en hudati*—with water—*with* the Spirit—*with* fire—you must not forget 1. That in half the occurrences it is *not en*, but simply the dative of instrument—*with* water, etc. 2. By the inspired pen *the mode* is *given—pour*. The Spirit was poured upon them—they were baptized *with* it. The fire came down upon them—“sat upon each of them”—baptized them. 3. We showed that *en* is used often for *with*—“rule *with* (*en*) a rod of iron.” “Anoint *en with* oil”—“mix *en with* oil”—and I can adduce forty-one *consecutive* occurrences of it thus in a small part of the Bible—in Numbers and Leviticus, etc. It is used where they cleanse a house *en* with water *sprinkled* on it, *en* with the blood of a bird, etc., etc. Hundreds of such cases occur. Now I have shown where *often en* means *with*, where they are *stated cases of sprinkling* and *pouring*. Let him adduce *stated* or *certain* cases of *immersion* in the Bible where *en* occurs indicating *instrumentality*, or even location. I am sustained by all the ancient English versions—six; by all the Latin ancient and modern, save Jerome, and he renders the *hudati* where *en* does not occur simply *aqua with* water. I am sustained by the French, Italian, Spanish, Lusitanian and German—*mit wasser*—with water.

Eis comes up again. We say these little prepositions do not, cannot settle any point here. We quoted a number of cases, selecting those involving *water*—yea, *Jordan, water, sea*—a ship is launched *eis* the sea, parties were to go *eis to* Jordan, meet certain parties *eis at* Jordan, *eis* at or on Carmel; people came up *out of* Jordan, Moses drawn *ek* out of the water; Ex. ii, 10; Josh. iv, 16–20; yet no immersion was involved, but we know the reverse—they were all on dry land *save* Moses, he was in a basket floating above water—his basket bearing him up.

We showed that *eis* could not primarily mean *into*, and *not one* of the better Lexicons or Grammarians gives *into* as its primary force. We quoted them formerly. As for Dodridge, Geo. Campbell or Tillottson, etc., whom Dr. Graves and others quote so often, as philologists they are far from being so recognized anywhere by the great scholars of Europe and America. McKnight and a swarm of good, pious men, quoted by immersionists are *ignored* in philology and accurate criticism by the scholarship of this country. No body but immersionists pay the least attention to them now. Howson and Conybeare, immersionists, and Lange, we admit frankly as great critics, but not the others adduced. But they—Conybeare, Howson and Lange, and indeed *all* immersionists, base their opinions on *no* scientific or philological ground, but on *their* opinion of Rom. vi, 4, “buried by baptism into death.” Hence *their* opinion here is of little moment, since it is not on any scientific principle of language. And Conant, Eaton, etc., will tell us, this is wholly a question of *philology* based on laws of language. And *here and here only*, Baptists have based it *from the beginning*, and we intend to hold them to it. As to Dr. Dale’s position—his rules of interpretation—they are utterly untenable, unscientific, and contrary to all the laws of language. Words never are formed—never take on secondary meanings by the mystical, obscure and metaphysical processes he points out. The law of language is far more simple than he assumes. He is a fine scholar—in research most valuable, but wretched in philology.

Pindar, Dr. Graves thinks, uses *baptizo* for *dip*. Not so. No dip can be made of it. It will be seen at a reading that it cannot mean dip. The allusion is to the waves dashing their spray upon the cork “above the net.” If the allusion were to the weights below pulling the cork under, it would be *sink*, *i. e.*, *immersit*—but no one presumes it thus; for the allusion is made to the impotent ravings, the abuse, the aspersions of his enemies, and the strongest that can rightly be made of it is—*overwhelm* by the waves falling upon it, all pointing to affusion, as formerly shown.

He has taken up much time on the localities of John’s

baptism, as if it supported dipping. We will account for it on *Scriptural* ground in this speech, not on the mere conjectures of the Doctor that involve obscurity. Once more, Rom. vi, 4, "buried by baptism into death," comes up. But we are on baptism with or in water, not a "buried into death." He plays on the word "bury." Hear Jeremiah xxii, 19:

"Tell the King he shall be drawn forth outside the gates of the city *and* BURIED WITH THE BURIAL OF AN ASS."

Here is the same English and Greek word—here TWICE used, *no interment*, no envelopment—he was left on top of the earth, to rot, be devoured by dogs and vultures. Yet on such a word, not involving mode necessarily at all, he relies for support. As we said, it applies to any disposal of the dead. It is used here metaphorically also, and we want its literal meaning. As to what the Doctor heard, a bigoted immersion lawyer, who got vexed at me, tried to rule me out of my right to correct misrepresentations, etc., it is of no account. He was an out and out immersionist before the debate, and his opinion is of no moment.

My Brother says *baptidzo* is *immergo*—immerse. Is that true? *Immergo* is not *dip*, but the opposite. Dip is to put in and quickly take out. *Immergo*, never removes, or takes out its object. That must be an *emerge*. *Immergo* is to *sink in*. There its force ends. If *baptidzo* is equal to it, it always leaves its object sunk. Whatever living thing *baptidzo* puts under a liquid, it *always* perishes, as used in all ancient, classic Greek. If *baptidzo* were equivalent to *immergo*, whenever it applied to living objects, and wherever it put them under any liquid, they would perish. If *baptidzo* meant *immerse*, then the commission could mean nothing less than to drown—cause to perish—all nations or the parties disciplined. It has no such New Testament meaning. Hence its religious use vastly differs from its classic use, whatever be the mode.

THE LAVER BAPTISM AND JOHN'S BAPTISM.

We now propose to give a just and Scriptural reason for the *places* of John's baptism: for certainly the ordinary reasons assigned are altogether absurd. We have *these* as facts to start with. 1. John baptized at *first*, "*beyond Jordan*"—

John i, 28; "*away beyond Jordan*"—John x, 40-42, called Bethany, Bethabara being a *forged* reading—it is Bethany in all ancient MS. versions, and, in the four immersion versions of our day—Baptist, A. Campbell, Anderson, Wilson—"Christ dwelt in the same place for a time"—John x, 40-42. 2. John baptized "at Jordan" *epi*, "*at Enon*." The words *epi*, *eis*, *en*, point out the location interchangeably. 3. It involves absurdity that people should go to Jordan from *Jerusalem*, where all immersionists tell us there are so many pools of water, some *forty-five* to *forty-seven* feet deep, all aggregating some *four acres* of water, go to Jordan to get enough to immerse in. And what of the fact patent to all, that every Jew every day of the world, from one to two and three or four times a day even, baptized himself? Why did John leave Bethany for Jordan? then leave Jordan for Enon? Reason, the Bible and well-known facts will make it clear.

BAPTISM OUT OF THE LAVER.

The most perfect historic record of baptism we have, is that of the Jews at *the laver*, running through fifteen hundred years, of daily occurrence. In the origin of baptism we see also the design of baptism—that it was purely symbolic and *not initiative*, nor *sacramental*. In Exodus xxx, 18-21, we read of the laver that stood between the altar of burnt offerings and the door of the tabernacle. "Aaron and his sons shall wash (*rachats*) their hands and their feet (*ek*) out of it.* And when they go into the tabernacle of the congregation, they shall wash with water, that they die not." In Exodus xl, 12: "Thou shalt bring Aaron and his sons unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and wash them with water;" v. 30, "and put water therein to wash (*ek*) out of it;" v. 31. "Moses, and Aaron, and his sons, washed their hands and their feet (*ex autou*) out of it." Thus washing was kept up daily till the days of Christ. Now—

1 We are all agreed that these washings expressed by *rachats* in Hebrew, *nipto* in Greek, sometimes by *louo*, were baptisms. There is no dispute here Drs. Carson, Gale,

Rachats—out of it—Greek *Kai nipsetai ex autou, niptontai ex autou, eniptetai ex autou*.

Fuller, Hinton, Ingham, A. Campbell, all tell us this washing was *immersion—baptism*. It is expressed in Judith xii, 7; Sirach (Ecclesiastes) xxiv, 31, (same xxxi, 30) and in other Greek writers as well as Mark vii, 4; Luke xi, 38, by *baptidzo*.

2. Hence A. Campbell: "And the laver—filled with water * * *in* this laver * * the priests always washed themselves before they approached the sanctuary." * * "This vessel was called in Greek *loutaer*, and the water in it *loutron*. * * * Paul more than once alludes to this usage in the tabernacle in his epistles, and once substitutes Christian *immersion* in its place." * Again; "The divers washing (*baptismois*) of cups, etc., and things mentioned among the traditions of the elders, and *the institutions of the laver* were for *ceremonial cleansing*. Hence *all by immersion*." † Dr. A. Campbell cites the washings of the person in Leviticus xv entire, and xvi, as the baptism to which Paul refers, Heb. ix, 10. ‡ These he tells us are Paul's "divers baptisms," "*or baptisms on divers occasions!*" As if there was any *diversity* in the kind of "bathings." The *divers* refers to differences in kind, *unlike*, different sorts. There could be no diversity in the bathings of the same persons if *all were immersed in water*. It is supremely ridiculous when he makes (*diaphorais*) different sorts, refer to *different times!* But they *were* baptisms—that is settled on all sides. He urges that they were all "for *ceremonial cleansing*." This, then, was the *primary* design of baptism and so continued fifteen hundred years till Christ, A. C. being witness. Carson, Ingham, Gale, Brents, as well as Dr. Graves, all agree those washings were baptisms.

The *mode* of those laver baptisms is what we are now to consider.

* Christian Baptism, vol. v, 401.

† Christian Baptist, 167. See Dr. Brent's Gos. Plan, 338-9, same in substance.

‡ In Lev. ch. xv, verses 5, 8, 10, 11, 13, 16, 18, 21, 22, 27. Here are ten diverse bathings in one chapter. Their whole flesh is said to be bathed, etc. Also Lev. xvi, 26, 27. Lev. xvii, 15, 16. In Num. also xix, 7, 8, 19. In all we have sixteen different bathings mentioned in order to purification. These are therefore called by Paul 'divers baptisms' or *baptisms on divers occasions*!! Ch. Bap. 174, also 177. Did man ever read such puerile sophistry?

1. The priests washed (*ex autou*) *out of* the laver, not *in* it. Hence it was not immersion. They baptized with the water of the laver. Yet it was done (*ek*) *out of*, not *in* the laver.

2. In every place in the Pentateuch where they washed (baptized) where the laver occurs, it is either "*wash out of it*," or "*wash with water*," not *once* is it wash in, or bathe in, in the Greek. Nay, in the whole five books of Moses (*Pentateuch*) in the Greek wash (*en*) never occurs *but once* where *any* personal washing occurs, and in that instance, it is, as often, *with*. Ezek. xvi, 9, "I have washed thee (*en*) *with* water, * * I anointed thee (*en*) *with* oil—" *i. e.*, the oil was poured on the person.

3. But we have some facts still more decisive, if more decisive could be desired. If anything needing cleansing—*i. e.*, anything ceremonially defiled, was touched to the water, or touched by any object, everything touching it became unclean. If the unclean touched the water, it became unclean, unless "running water," "a fountain," Lev. xi, 36, or pit wherein is plenty of water—literally—"gathering together of waters"—perpetually supplied with springs. The general law is—"WHATSOEVER THE UNCLEAN PERSON TOUCHETH, SHALL BE UNCLEAN." * "He that toucheth the water of separation shall be unclean until even." † By the law of Moses, if a person touched a dead carcass which divided hoof yet was not cloven-footed, nor chewed cud, was unclean. ** If a Jew touched a dead mole, mouse, snail, tortoise, weasel, lizard, chameleon, ferret, he was unclean. ‡ "And upon whatsoever any of them, when they are dead, doth fall, it shall be unclean; whether it be any vessel of wood, or raiment, or skin, or sack, whatever vessel it be wherein any work is done, it must be put into water, [brought to the water—*i. e.*, *washed*] and it shall be unclean until the even; so it shall be cleansed. And every earthen vessel, whereinto any of them falleth, *whatsoever is in it* shall be unclean; and ye shall break it." "Of all meat which may be eaten, that *on which such water cometh* (there is the *mode* of cleansing the meat—2 Chron. iv, 6,) shall be

* Numbers xix, 22.

** Leviticus xi, 26.

† Numbers xix, 21.

‡ Leviticus xi, 26.

unclean: and *all drink* that may be drunk *in every such vessel, shall be unclean.*" ‡ In Leviticus xv, 2-33, is a detail also of means by which any one becomes unclean, as well as in Num. xix, 9-22. Every such uncleanness required baptism. See also Lev. vi, 28; vii, 18-21.

Hence if Jew, or priest had touched, or dipped *hand* or *fingers* in the laver, all its waters would have become unclean, and emptied out, and the laver purified before it could be used. The Jewish Rabbins are full of facts to the same effect. "If, therefore, the waters that went above the juncture (of the hand) *return* upon the hands, *they* are unclean." * Hence, if the water poured on, or by the other hand dashed above the juncture, running down, defiled the purified hand, because it had effected purification above that point, how much less would they have allowed parties to plunge their whole bodies in the laver? *The laver was purposely so made that no one could touch its water only as it poured out at the places made—the cocks—at the base expressly for that purpose—so made that nothing unclean could crawl up and die in it, to defile it.* See Lev. xi, 33.

4. Hence, the laver in Solomon's temple for the same reasons † was set upon twelve molten oxen far up off the floor, then it was eight feet nine inches deep, which added to its being placed above the level of the floor on the oxen, made it twenty-one feet to its top. It stood out in the open way, and thus arranged, no one could by design or accident touch its waters, *only as they ran out of the cocks arranged for that purpose.* They had to literally *wash* (*min*, Gr. *ek*) *out of it, not in it.* It was ten cubits in diameter, five cubits deep—*i. e.*, eight and three-quarters feet deep, bulged or flared out, and held, says Dr. Gale, the Baptist, quite a thousand barrels of water. The water was forced in by machinery at the bottom from a water course or aqueduct prepared for that purpose. No one could touch its water. To immerse in it would make unclean the whole sea of water. To get into it would have required a leap of twenty-one feet into the air, catch the brim, roll in,

‡ Leviticus xi, 34.

* Horæ Heb., Lightfoot ii, 417—Alsop, 38, and many such cases.

† 1 Kings viii, 38; 2 Chron. iv, 2.

and then if not a good swimmer, he would be drowned, as the water was nearly nine feet deep, bottom concave. As people, male and female, passed constantly, all this would be done with garments on. But it becomes altogether ridiculous as well as impossible, being also *forbidden by the law*.

5. The second temple, like the tabernacle, as far as the record goes, had but one laver for both priests and meats to be sacrificed. Both the priests and meats were washed with its waters. Would they wash both in the same laver? It was a positive command not to use the water that had cleansed any object as it became unclean. In this laver, at first, there were but two cocks, or outlets, at the bottom, but afterwards they made twelve.* “The basis of it was so contrived as to receive the water which ran out of the laver at certain spouts. At these spouts the priests washed their hands and their feet before they entered upon their ministry. For if they had put their hands and feet into the laver, the water would have been defiled by the first that washed therein. And the sea of brass made by Solomon was so high that they could not put their feet into it. The Talmudists tell us there were twelve spouts or cocks, in the form of a woman’s breast, to let the water out of the laver, so that the twelve priests who attended upon the daily sacrifices, might wash there together.”† Moreover, Lev. xi, 34, tells the mode of the washing—“that (meat) on which such water cometh—” the water was poured on it.

6. Josephus, in speaking of the priests washing thereat, uses *wash* and *sprinkle* alternately and *interchangeably*—“The sea to be for the washing of the hands and the feet of the priests”—“Whence the priests might wash their hands and *sprinkle their feet*.” “When he had sprinkled Aaron’s vestments, himself and his sons.”‡ Yet the Bible said he *washed* himself, Aaron and his sons. Josephus was a high priest in the apostolic days, and knew just what the washing was.

7. The Scriptures habitually speak of a person washed where only the hands or feet, or both, are washed. So do we

* See Brown’s Antiquities, ii, 139-141, Kitto’s Cyclo., art. **Laver**.

† Bishop Patrick on Ex. xxx, 18-19.

‡ Antiquities, VIII, ch. viii, § 5, 6—III, ch. vi, § 2.

constantly in all our tongues. Have you washed? That is, have you washed your face, your hands? In Luke vii, 34-48, we learn that it was the custom to wash before meals. The term used is "water upon my feet"—*epi*. That is, they sprinkled their feet, and Christ accepts the woman's tears as accomplishing that. In Mark vii, 2, they will not eat with *defiled*, that is, unwashed hands. A. Campbell's version has this done "by pouring a little water on them." Yet Luke xi, 38, applies *baptidzo* to this practice. Tobit ii, 3-5, tells of a man strangled and cast out *in the market (agora)*. Tobit takes him away. Tobit is in the market-place which requires baptism before he can eat—Mark vii, 4. He touches a dead body—that requires baptism before he can eat. He says "Then, before I tasted my meat, I started up and took him away"—the dead body—"and returning, I washed (*elousa-maen—louo*) myself and ate my meat in sadness." Here *louo* occurs where Ecclesiastes 34: 31: (Gr. 31, 30); Luke xi, 38; Mark vii, 4, apply *baptidzo*. In Mark vii, 2, 3, *nipto* is so applied—washing *the hands* was *baptizing* the person. They also baptized their cups, pots, brazen vessels and *couches (klinon)*, Mark vii, 4. "They wash—baptize—all things before the Sabbath."* Hence the two most ancient copies of the Bible in the world, transcribed between A. D. 300 and 325, the Vatican and Sinaitic manuscripts translated the word *baptized*; Mark vii, 4, *sprinkle*. So do eight others of later date, and Euthymius, a Greek father of the fourth century, because they knew *these* baptisms were *always* by sprinkling—not even copious pouring of water—for ceremonial purification. Very often ancient copyists translated a word where they wished its sense understood. The object was to distinguish this Jewish practice, never commanded of God, Mark vii, 4, from any heaven sanctioned ordinance. Hence baptism is *transferred*.

8. The Targum of Jonathan being a paraphrase and not *literal*, as Onkelos and Ben Uzziel, puts it beyond all question, aside from these facts. On Exodus xxx, 19, where they were to wash out of it—the laver—where the Hebrew is *rachats*, the Targum reads: "They shall take for a washing of purifi-

* See Lightfoot, Chal. and Bap. Lex. a *Tebal*.

cation *out of it*, and Aaron and his sons shall sanctify (*kadash*) with the waters their hands and their feet." Exodus xi, 30-31. Of the laver and its use—the Targum has it thus: "And put therein living waters for sanctifying, so that they should not fail nor become dead all days," *i. e.*, forever. "And Moses and Aaron and his sons received [or took—*nasab*] *out of it* [water] for washing, and sanctified their hands and their feet *out of it*"—(*minnaeh*).

If these facts do not show how they washed—baptized—out of the laver, no words can. The Greek version used by the apostles says *louo*, *niplo*—wash; Josephus uses sprinkle—often interchanges with pour, as will be seen—and the Targum of this learned Jew, when he knew all about it, confirming it, and the law of God so worded as to allow of no other. Num. viii, 7, shows they sprinkled to cleanse or sanctify; Heb. ix, 13, also.

Here then we have these facts. Now in Christ's day all these baptisms were performed with utmost care. Immersionists tell us that over all Palestine, Jews had deep—22 feet deep, 16 feet wide cisterns, hewn in some cases out of rocks. Some families had two, all full of water. Hence when we see from Lev. xi, xv, xvi, entire; Num. xix entire, compared with Mark vii, 4, 8; Luke xi, 38; Eccles. xxxv, 24; Judith xii, 7, where *baptidzo* is applied to these washings, and *they* all assert Paul means them by his "*divers baptisms*." Heb. ix, 10, *they* tell us the Jews baptized in those cisterns of water!! What! when their law, kept so scrupulously *as to ceremonies* above all else—they violate the plain letter and command repeated so often in Moses; "Whatsoever the unclean person **TOUCHETH** shall be unclean." That if water were in a vessel and any unclean object fell in it, all must be emptied out, and if the vessel be wood, washed; if metallic, it must be *burned* out. See also Num. xxxi, 23; if earthenware, broken. All in such was *unclean*, not only that as to *ceremonial* defilement, but *actual physical* defilement is involved here. Do you suppose a man of say five in family would use water for *drinking*, cooking, and cleansing ceremonially, *in which for three and four months* during dry seasons, *in the same water*, in a cistern, he, his wife

and children *every day immersed* their entire bodies? Jews so doubly nice they would not allow themselves, in Christ's day, to *touch* a gentile or one unclean, if possible to avoid it, and would not go in where Christ was being tried, lest they by contact, be defiled—they drink water thus used!! Yet the immersion theory says *they did!!* No sir; they *all* baptized by affusion. Now then the laver baptisms extended through 1500 years. Every Jew baptized every day, often several times. They generally numbered five and six millions. Let us put it at the *lowest* figure—1500 years, 365 days in a year, make 547,500 days. Then multiply those days upon the number of Jews—put them at *four* millions on the average for 1500 years—from Moses till the commission was given, we have ONE TRILLION, SIX HUNDRED AND FORTY-FIVE BILLIONS, FIVE HUNDRED MILLIONS, (1,645,500,000,000) of instances of baptism, ALL BY AFFUSION, when John began to baptize Jews as a Jew, that Christ might be made manifest to Israel. We can now see the force of "*baptize with water.*" Now then, at first we saw that John, when only the few as yet came—no noise, no multitude yet named—the baptisms at Bethany were so noiselessly carried on, that it is only named by *one* writer, then, *incidentally*; so, not a word is said of multitudes at Enon—the noise and flush of the crowds are all over. At Jordan we have *the multitudes*—Mark i, v; Matt. iii, 5, "they at Jerusalem," as well as "all Judea," etc. Now *why* did he go to those three places—at two of which were *running* waters, we know, and *plenty* of it at the *first* one? when so few as yet came, no allusion is made to water at all—at Bethany or in Bethany simply.

1st. Such crowds, with all their animals, *had* to have, *must* have water. Round Lake Camp meeting is not there because of convenient places to *immerse*. Camp meetings, armies encamped for a few weeks, have to have much water. Here are thousands of people for *many* weeks, *some months*. Then much water was needed. But

2d. That *much water had to be* RUNNING water *by the law* of God. We cited many passages, especially Leviticus xi, 38, shows that fountains—so the Syriac and Arabic render Enon; or "gathering together—flowing together" of waters *could not*

be defiled, because running off constantly and fresh, clean water coming into their place. If it had been even a convenient lake 100 feet square and fifty deep in middle, the moment one washed in it, or an unclean animal, person or thing, fell into or stepped into it, or water running from your hands or face after ablution had fallen into it, it could not be used. But such crowds had to have water, use it for all customary purposes. Hence the running waters of Jordan were sought.

The moment the flush of the crowds is over, John leaves the hot, low region of lower Jordan; the lowest spot above water on our globe, deep between ranges of hills, in about the latitude of Memphis, Tennessee, and so *intensely* hot, that no city or village ever was built upon its banks in that region; and we next find him at Enon near Salim, for there was much water there, not *deep*, the word *polla* never meant deep on earth, "many waters" or fountains, is far more correct, as the Syriac and Arabic have it. There was enough water in the springs of those mountain regions for the numbers coming now for all customary purposes. Hence we have here *Bible* reasons for all we see. They baptized *at Enon*, *with water*. They had known no other mode than affusion for fifteen hundred years. Custom demands its acceptance here as the recognized mode. The *primary* meaning of *baptidzo* settles it as the mode. Instead of the facts forcing us from the primary import here, they all point to it as the only mode. And if we want *current* or *general* usage, that has been the usage *fifteen hundred years*. Nay, the Jews of those days tell us how much water was necessary to their ablutions in general. "They allot a *one-fourth part of a log* for the washing of one person's hands, it may be of *two*; half a log for *three* or *four*; a *whole* log for *five* to *ten*, nay to *one hundred*, with this provision, saith Rabbi Jose, that the last that washed hath no less than a *fourth part of a log* for himself." Lightfoot, *Horæ*, ii, 254. A log is five-sixths ($\frac{5}{6}$) of a pint. One person then washed with nearly *one-fifth* of a pint. Its mode is told us by Pococke also—*aqua effusa vase* with water *poured out of a vessel*, cup or bowl. See Maimonides.

When it is asked why both Philip and the eunuch *went*

down *eis* to the water or into it, if you prefer, and why he sent not a pitcher for water, if he was to be sprinkled, we answer, by the Bible Philip and he recognized, if he had such vessels as immersionists suggest, they were all ceremonially unclean when used indifferently thus by an unclean person. Hence we can see why *both* went down to the water. *Ek* means *out of* we admit, not like *apo* in Christ's baptism, which is from *always* when motion is involved, NEVER out of. Yet *ek* often is *from*, and does not at all imply emergence as the many texts cited where the parties came up *out* of Jordan, Moses drawn *ek*, *out of* the water, show. Here then are the issues:

Dr. Graves has *no proof of immersion*. All the facts he adduces are *perfectly* consistent with affusion as the mode all the time. *En often, over and again* means *with* where the element whose use it indicates, with oil, with water, with blood, *was sprinkled*, was *poured* on the party; *it says* so, giving us *raino* and *cheo* as the modes. His *en* saves him not. It points to *instrumentality*, not location, here; baptize *with* water, *with* the Spirit, *with* fire. The Spirit, the fire, the water, were not localities, but *instrumentalities*, and *en* NEVER means *in* when thus used.—[*Time out.*]

DR. GRAVES' SIXTH SPEECH.

MR. PRESIDENT:—There are two words entering into this discussion, the meaning of which is very important to determine. These have already been the subject of much discussion between us. They are, respectively, *en* and *eis*; the former of which it has been conceded means *in*, and the latter *into*. Now look at our rules. I will read the second one:

“The *literal*, which is also called the *grammatical sense* of a word, is *the sense* so connected with it that it is first in order, and is spontaneously presented to the mind as soon as the sound is heard. This meaning is always (save in one lexicon, *i. e.* *Stokius*) placed first in the lexicons, and is known as the *primary* meaning.”

Now we are compelled, by the rules of interpretation, to place those whom John baptized *in the* water, and to admit that Christ was baptized into the river Jordan; and my opponent will not presume to deny it. He knows that I am right in this construction.

The labored effort of Eld. Ditzler touching the purification and ceremonial washings of the Jews was “love’s labor lost.” Why, my dear sir, large books do not necessarily make large arguments—by no means. His whole force was spent in beating the air. No Baptist under the sun ever pretended that they were compelled to jump into that laver that he showed us the picture of. Never! never! That was made for your delectation. But why did John go to Jordan? Why did he go to Enon, where water was plentiful, if he only sprinkled a few drops on the face of each candidate whom he baptized? Never did any Jewish priest before resort to these or like localities when rites of purification on a large scale had to be performed, *never*. Why, John could have taken them to the pool of Siloam, and could have dipped up a pitcher full and that would have sufficed for sprinkling a thousand. But I want to know how I am committed to the theory that all the purifications of the Old Testament were so many baptisms.

I will tell him how I will commit myself to it. In every case of purification when *tavel* is used, I will say that was by the immersion of the whole body, but in no other cases; and there were divers immersions for different kinds of purification.

I will produce just one from many authorities to settle this point forever:

"RABBI MAIMONIDES. "Wherever in the law washing of the flesh or clothes is mentioned, it means *nothing else* than dipping of the whole body in a laver; for if a man dips himself all over except the tip of his little finger, he is still in his uncleanness."

"Every one that is baptized [as they were, on coming from the market,] must *immerse the whole body*." "In a laver which holds forty *seahs* [about one hundred gallons] of water, every defiled person dips himself, except a profluous man; and in it they dip all unclean vessels. A bed that is wholly defiled, if he dip it part by part, is pure. If he dip the bed in the pool, although its feet are plunged in the thick clay at the bottom of the pool, it is clean. What shall he do with a pillow or bolster of skin? He must dip them and lift them out by the fringes."

Well, my sixth.

But before I go to that let me briefly recur to another point.

He said: "Why not bring fresh *modern* authority in reference to the meaning of the passage, 'buried with Christ in baptism.' " Well, I will read on this subject from Conybeare, and Howson:

"With Him, therefore, we were buried by the baptism wherein we shared his death [when we sank beneath the waters] &c. This clause which is here left elliptical, is fully expressed in Col. ii:12. This passage cannot be understood unless it be borne in mind that the primitive baptism was by immersion."—*Notes on Rom. vi.*

Then, Mr. President, you know something about the power of evidence. He says: "My friend can bring up a hundred authorities in support of his views, but I can bring up hundreds too." But here it must be borne in mind that mine are all made up of Pedobaptist authorities.

Moses Stuart thus comments on this passage:

"As many of us as have become devoted to Christ by Baptism; as many as have been consecrated to Christ by baptism; or been laid under peculiar obligations, or taken upon them a peculiar relation to him, by being baptized."

We have been baptized into his death; i. e., we have, as it were, been made partakers of his death by baptism; we have come under special relation to his death; we have engaged to die unto sin, as he died for it;

we have a communion or participation in death to sin; comp. Rom. 6:6; Gal. 2:19. *The being baptized into his death is, therefore, an internal, moral, spiritual thing, of which the external rite of baptism is only a symbol; for the relation symbolized by baptism is in its own nature spiritual and moral.*"

His theory, then, you see, coincided with what I have advanced.

Argument.

I will now resume where I concluded my fifth argument, &c.

SIXTH ARGUMENT.—CHRIST CLEARLY INDICATED THE ACTION OF HIS BAPTISM AND OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM FOR ALL TIME WHEN HE DECLARED THAT IN IT HE SYMBOLICALLY *fulfilled all righteousness*.

CONCLUSIVE AUTHORITY. I offer one authority my opponent never questions. In the Wilkes-Ditzler debate, page 483, Eld. Ditzler, speaking of the lustration of Judith, declares that, were it immerse, it would at least be "*eis ten pegen*," accusative case, with *eis* into, not "*epi*, at."

So I say now, we have the very expression Eld. Ditzler calls for in the declaration of Mark: "And he [Christ] was baptized of him *eis ton Jordanen*." Christ, therefore, was immersed by John into the Jordan. It will not be creditable to any scholar to deny it.

Having developed in a former speech the full meaning of this phrase to break the force of my opponent's unsupported assertion, I will support my views by two or three authorities.

The great McKnight, Presbyterian, says:

"Christ's baptism was not the baptism of repentance, for he never committed any sin, but he submitted to be baptized—that is, to be buried under the water by John, and to be raised up out of it again as an emblem of his future death and resurrection. In like manner the baptism of believers is emblematical of their death and resurrection. Preliminary Essay on Epistles."

Joel Jones, LL D., President of Girard College, in "Jesus and the Coming Glory:"

"Suffer it,' etc, rather *aphes arte*, 'suffer at *this* time.' There is a tact allusion to another time or coming, as if the Lord had said, 'I have now come to offer the human body [he should have said to pour out his own soul] as a sacrifice for sin, and the baptism of it, which I seek at your hands, is a typical showing forth of the sacrifice I am to make; but I

shall come at another time, and at that, my second coming, this rite will not be proper, for then I will come without a sin offering, not in a body to be sacrificed for, but in glory.' May we not suppose that the Lord then first made known to him the mystery of his suffering and his death? It was after that, too, that John called Jesus the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world. John could take part with him in this typically set forth 'thus it becometh *us*.'"

Kendrick, in his notes on Olshausen, says :

"The law required not that he should submit himself to John's baptism, but it did require that an expiation should be offered, and his willingness to offer this, was expressed by Christ in the symbolic rite of baptism; thus his baptism was a type and prophecy of the real baptism of death and resurrection."

S. H. Ford, LL. D., on Symbolism of Baptism, beautifully says :

"Jesus was baptized *for* his death—to image or declare it. He was baptized to show how an atonement [satisfaction] must be made; how a righteousness must be brought in; how the law must be met and honored. His baptism was *for* these great ends, designed to show forth these as its object and purpose. For this it was instituted. This gave it, and still gives it all its importance. It is *for* righteousness, it shows how it was fulfilled; it is for remission, it shows how it was secured; it is for salvation, it shows it, expresses it, declares it."

"Thus did the glorious Prince of Life
All righteousness fulfill,
In emblem of that fearful strife
Where, by his Father's will,
He sank beneath death's darker flood,
And Angels saw him bathed in blood."

SEVENTH ARGUMENT. CHRIST CLEARLY DEFINES THE ACTION OF HIS BAPTISM, WHEN HE COMPARED THE SUFFERINGS HE WAS TO UNDERGO TO HIS BAPTISM IN THE JORDAN.

He said, "I have a baptism to be baptized in, and how am I straightened till it be accomplished?"

He certainly did not refer to a slight sprinkling of suffering, but to that overwhelming of anguish and suffering, when he made his soul an offering for sin; when the chastisement of our peace was laid upon him, when he sank in death, and was buried in the grave and rose again. This was symbolically fulfilled or foreshadowed in his baptism in the Jordan, and to this he evidently alludes in this passage.

David, as the type of Christ, represents him as saying. See

Bailey, p. 232: Ps. lxxix, 14, 15, "Let me be delivered from them that hold me, and out of the deep waters. Let not the waterfloods overflow me, neither let the deep swallow me up, and let not the pit shut her mouth upon me."

Ps. lxxxviii, 7, and 16, 17, "Thy wrath lieth hard upon me, and thou hast afflicted me with all thy waves. * * * Thy fierce wrath goeth over me; thy terrors have cut me off. They come round about me daily like water; they compassed me about together." Also Ps. cxxiv, 4, 5, Ps. xviii, 16, Ps. xxxii, 6.

EIGHTH ARGUMENT. BUT WE HAVE THE EXPLICIT AND UNMISTAKABLE TESTIMONY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT BY THE PEN OF PAUL, TELLING US THE ACT WHICH CHRIST RECEIVED AT THE HANDS OF JOHN. ROM. VI, 3-5—*i. e.* A BURIAL, A PLANTING IN THE LIKENESS OF DEATH.

If this alludes to *water* baptism, which it must, since Christ never was baptized in the Spirit, then he was *buried* by John in the waters of the Jordan, *planted* in the likeness of his own future death. We know that when a person or thing is "*buried*" it is "*covered up*," so when a seed is planted, it is *buried in the earth*. Here we have two *inspired* definitions of *baptidzo*, which we must receive, unless we are willing to profane the Spirit's teachings.

Baptize, "to bury," "to plant" to "*cover wholly out of sight*." But the phrase "planted in the *likeness* of death," is, if possible, still stronger. What is *the* likeness of death? There is only one *likeness* of death in the universe. Some years ago a reward of one thousand gold dollars was offered to any artist who would paint two likenesses of death. No one has yet claimed the reward. I will guarantee that Eld. D. shall have that reward, if he will only suggest two. The Holy Spirit says *the* not *a*, and this implies that there is but one likeness of death, as when I maintain that immersion is *the* act which Christ commanded, I maintain he commanded no other act, as sprinkling or pouring. A *burial* is the likeness of death, and *the only* likeness of death.

Let Eld. D. exercise his logical talent upon this position and overthrow it, or failing to do so, let him honestly and frankly admit its conclusive force. It is simply conclusive and unan-

swerable. Let him meet it. He will not essay to do it. That the apostle does refer to water baptism here, is not only obvious to the common reader, but frankly admitted by all the most learned Pedobaptists whose works have reached us; the only exceptions are a few controversialists.

"CYRIL, made Bishop of Jerusalem in A. D. 350, writing in Greek, says: 'For as Jesus assuming the sins of the world died, that having slain sin he might raise thee up in righteousness, so also thou, *going down into the water* (*katabas eis hudor*,) and in a manner *buried in the water*, (*kai tropon tina en tois hudasi tapheis*), as he is in the rock, art raised again, walking in newness of life.'—(Ins. iii, on *Bap.*, xii)."

"BASIL, made Bishop of Cæsarea in A. D. 370, says: 'Imitating the burial of Christ *by the immersion* (*dia tou baptismatos*); for the bodies of those *immersed* (*baptidzomenon*) are, as it were, *buried in the water* (*enthaptai to hudati*).' (*On the Holy Spirit*, c. xv, 35). Again: "The water presents the image of death, receiving the body as in a tomb.' Also, on *Bap.* b. i. c. i, 4: 'Which we seem to have covenanted by the *immersion* (*baptismatos*) *in water* (*en to hudati*), professing to have been crucified with, to have been buried with,' etc."

"GREGORY, of Nazianzen, born about A. D. 330: 'Let us therefore, be buried with Christ *by the immersion* (*dia tou baptismatos*), that we may also rise with him; let us go down with him, that we may also be exalted with him.' Disc. 40, on the *Holy Bap.*"

"JOHN, of Damascus, born about the end of the seventh century: 'For the *immersion* (*to baptisma*) shows the Lord's death. We are indeed buried with the Lord *by the immersion* (*dia tou baptismatos*), as says the holy apostle.'—*On the Ortho. Faith*, b. iv, c. 9."

"CHRYSOSTOM, made Bishop and Patriarch of Constantinople in A. D. 398: 'For to be *immersed* (*baptiesthai*), and to sink down, then to emerge, is a symbol of the descent into the under world, and of the ascent from thence. Therefore Paul calls the immersion (*to baptisma*) the burial, saying, 'We were buried, therefore, with him by the immersion into death.'—(*Com. on 1 Cor.* Disc. xl, 1.)."

"TERTULLIAN.—'Know ye not that so many of us as *were immersed*, (*tincti sumus*) *were immersed* (*tincti sumus*), into his death?' (Quo. of Rom. vi, 3. *On the Resurrection of the Body*; chap. xlvii.) Again: 'We are *three times immersed*, (*ter mergimur*), answering somewhat more than the Lord prescribed in the gospel.'"

"LIMBORCH.—"The apostle alludes to the manner of baptizing, not as practiced at this day, which is performed by sprinkling of water, but as administered of old, in the primitive church, by immersing the whole body in water, a short continuance in the water, and a speedy emersion out of the water.'—*Com.*, in Epis ad Rom. vi, 4."

"P. MARTYR.—"As Christ, by baptism, hath drawn us with him into his death and burial, so he hath drawn us out into life. Thus doth the dipping

into water, and issuing forth again signify, when we are baptized.'—*Ora. conc. the Res. of Christ*, p. 11.

"F. SPANHEMIUS.—'This rite of immersion and of bringing out of the baptismal water was common and promiscuous in the apostolic age. Whence the apostle alludes to it, as a rite common to all Christians.' (Rom. vi, 4; Col. ii, 12)—*Dispu. de Bap. pro Mortu.*, p. 16."

"BOSSUET.—'The new birth of a believer is more express in immersion than in bare infusion or aspersion. For the believer being plunged in the water of baptism, is buried with Jesus Christ, as the apostle expresses it; and coming out of the water quits the tomb with his Savior, and more perfectly represents the mystery of Jesus Christ who regenerates him. Mersion, in which the water is applied to the whole body, and to all its parts, also more perfectly signifies that a man is fully and entirely washed from his defilements.'—*In Stennett*, p. 178."

"Bp. FELL.—'The primitive fashion of immersion under the water, representing our death, and elevation again out of it, our resurrection or regeneration.'—*On the Epistle of St. Paul*, on Rom. vi, 4."

"J. J. WETSTEIN.—'John baptized in the river Jordan, in Enon, "because there was much water," (John iii, 23); and Christ, when he was baptized, went down into the water, (Matthew iii, 16). And Christians, in baptism, are said to put off their clothes (Gal. iii, 27) to be washed, (Titus iii, 5), and to be buried under the water, (Rom. vi, 4); all which are expressive, not of sprinkling, but of dipping.—*Com. on Matthew iii, 6.*"

"BUDDEUS.—'Immersion, which was used in former times, was a symbol and an image of the death and burial of Christ; and at the same time it informs us that the remains of sin, which are called the *old man*, should be mortified.'—*Dog. Theol.*, 1. v. c. i., § 8."

"LUTHER.—'That the minister dippeth a child into the water, signifieth death; that he again bringeth him out of it, signifieth life. So Paul explains it (Romans vi,) * * * Being moved by this reason, I would have those that are to be baptized, to be entirely immersed, as the word imports and the mystery signifies.'—*In Dr. Du Veil, on Acts vii, 33. Vide Lutheri Catechis. Minor.*"

"BAXTER.—'In our baptism we are dipped under the water, as signifying our covenant profession, that as he was buried for sin, we are dead and buried to sin.'—*Para. on the New Testament, on Romans vi, 4.*"

"DR. HAMMOND.—'It is a thing that every Christian knows, that the immersion in baptism refers to the death of Christ; the putting the person into the water denotes and proclaims the death and burial of Christ.' On Romans vi, 3."

"DR. E. HARWOOD.—'When we were, therefore, immersed in baptism into the belief of his death,' (Romans vi, 4). 'With him have you been interred in your baptismal immersion.'—Col. ii, 12."

"DR. BARROW.—'The action is baptizing, or immersing in water. • • * * * The mersion also in water, and the emersion thence, doth figure our death,' etc.—*Works*, vol. i, pp. 518-520."

"DR. S. CLARKE.—'Romans viii, 11. And this was most significantly represented by their descending into the water, and rising out of it again. For as Christ descended into the earth, and was raised again from the dead by the glory of the Father, so persons baptized were buried with him by baptism into death, (Romans vi, 4), and rose again after the similitude of his resurrection.'—*Three Essays*, p. 12."

"WESLEY.—'"Buried with him," alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion.'—(*Notes on Roman vi, 4*)."

"PRESBY. REVIEW.—'We cannot but regret, therefore, that Mr. Ewing should have been guilty of so many gross and glaring blunders in his endeavor to make out a case in favor of sprinkling. * * * We have rarely met, for example, with a more weak and fanciful piece of reasoning than that by which Mr. Ewing would persuade us that there is no allusion to the mode by immersion in the expression, "buried with him in baptism." This point ought to be frankly admitted, and, indeed, cannot be denied with any show of reason.'—Vol. i, p. 531."

"OLSHAUSEN.—'In this place we must by no means think of their own resolutions only in baptism, or see no more in it than a figure, as if by the one-half of the ancient rite of baptism, the *submersion*, the death and burial of the old man—by the second half, the *emersion*, the resurrection of the new man—were no more than prefigured,' etc.—*Com. on Rom. vi, 3, 4*."

"THOLUCK.—'The baptismal symbol itself may be regarded as a figure of the death of Christ; and, accordingly, he in this verse represents the Christian undergoing baptism as being in some sort buried with the Savior.' 'For the explanation of this figurative description of the baptismal rite, it is necessary to call attention to the well known circumstance that, in the early days of the church, persons, when baptized, were first plunged below, and then raised above the water, to which practice, according to the direction of the apostle, the early Christians gave a symbolic import.'—On Romans vi, 4."

"BP. ELLICOTT, on Col. ii, 12, says, referring to Romans vi, 4: "There seems no reason to doubt (with Eadie) that both here and Rom. i, c. 2, there is an allusion to the *katadusis* and *anadusis* in baptism.'—*Com.*"

"DR. A. BARNES.—'It is altogether probable that the apostle in this place had allusion to the custom of baptizing by immersion.'"

"BP. BROWN.—'The comparison of baptism to burying and rising up again, (Romans vi; Col. ii,) has been already referred to as probably derived from the custom of immersion.'—In Dr. Smith's *Dictionary of Bible. Art. Bap.*

"DR. BLOOMFIELD.—'There is plainly a reference to the ancient mode of baptism by immersion; and I agree with Koppe and Rosenmuller that there is reason to regret it should have been abandoned in most Christian churches, especially as it has so evidently a reference to the mystic sense of baptism.' 'Wetstein adverts to the figurative use of bury as employed of plunging under water.' Theophylact observes 'that as we are by bap-

tism buried in the water, so Christ was buried in the earth.'—*Crit. Dig.*, on Romans vi, 4."

"CONYBEARE AND HOWSON.—'This passage cannot be understood unless it be borne in mind that the primitive baptism was by immersion.'—*Life and Epistles of Paul*, vol. ii, p. 209."

Can any one who has any respect for the authority of God's word, or the united learning of eighteen centuries presume to deny that these passages refer to water baptism, the act of immersion that Christ received at the hands of John, and which he enjoined upon all his disciples? It is the part of candor to acknowledge it. It would be doing outrage to inspiration to deny it. If it does allude to water baptism, then Christ was *buried* when he was baptized, as were his apostles and all the New Testament Christians.

I close here my argument on the *usus loquendi* drawn from the records of John's ministry, and have established the fact beyond the possibility of successful contradiction or reasonable doubt, that John was commanded to immerse, and only to immerse, and that he did immerse, and only immerse, those whom he baptized, and therefore the blessed Savior and his apostles were immersed, and that this was the beginhing of the gospel dispensation, Mark, by the Holy Spirit, expressly tells us, chapter i, 1, 2.

In reviewing the eight unmoved and immovable foundations of the massive argument drawn from John's ministry, I feel that I am fully authorized to use the language that Dr. Summers used with reference to another question:

"My argument has nothing to fear from the labor, learning, sophistry, or ignorance of its impugners, * * * as nothing can prove that false which is demonstratively true."—[*Time out.*]

DR. DITZLER'S SIXTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—I congratulate myself that the Doctor's argument was so light and unsubstantial, that the fall of the gavel destroyed it, as he admits. So I need not spend much time with it.

We certainly endorse his condemnation of the folly of Ewing in the wild definition he gave in his Essay or Treatise on Baptism. He tells us of the Presbyterian Review, what it says of those who do not bow to *their* opinion on these matters. Now Beza, the profoundest biblical critic of the sixteenth century, Moses Stuart and Hodge, two of the most eminent commentators America has produced, two of which are most eminent Presbyterians—either one of them far superior to *these* men in scholarship and *far* beyond them in fame—*all* assert that Rom. vi, 3–4, is *not* an allusion to water baptism. Why does not the Review condemn *them*? He had not biblical knowledge enough to know that they had thus written, we apprehend.

All the authorities quoted by the gentleman in his last speech, go on the assumption that the allusion of Rom. vi, 4, is to water baptism. And the entire fabric of the speech just delivered, is based upon this sandy foundation. This passage is clearly explained by another indited by the same apostle—1 Cor. xii, 13:

"For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether *we be* Jews or Gentiles, whether *we be* bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit."

Here Paul declares that all Christians whether they be converts from Judaism, or whether they be Gentile converts, are by one Spirit all baptized into one body. But Dr. Graves does not believe, Baptists generally do not believe, that water baptism incorporates a man in the body of Christ or makes him to drink of his spirit. But there is a baptism as we here see that does do that, and this is the same baptism, that is

called "one baptism," Eph. iv, 4, the effect of which puts us into Christ, crucifies us with him—its effect is we are buried into death—"delivers (*eis*) into death ALWAYS, 2 Cor. iv, 10-11, that makes us partakers of "the power of his resurrection." This is that "one baptism" of which all true believers partake and of which water baptism is merely a symbol. Of *water* baptism, Paul uses the *plural* form—Heb. vi. 2—"doctrine of BAPTISMS" where Christian baptism occurs, as well as of Jewish baptism—ix, 10.

Water baptism indeed has its value and importance, but apart from its spiritual significance, it amounts to nothing. As the Apostle Paul says of a Jew, "he is not a Jew which is one outwardly in the flesh: but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of man but of God." And yet he calls them "Jews," and the outward circumcision he calls "circumcision," and in like manner the baptism by water, he calls "baptism," notwithstanding it is that spiritual baptism that incorporates us with Christ that is the true and indispensable baptism without which we have neither part nor lot in the immunities of Christ's Kingdom. Now this, I affirm, and not water baptism, is that to which reference is made in Rom. vi, 4, "Buried with him by baptism into death," not into *water*.

The Doctor thinks I have—or at all events that I ought to have—great respect for bishops. Well, as to that, I respect a bishop just as I do any other man, not on account of his exalted position or of the functions of his office, but for his personal merits. I respect a bishop just as he follows Christ. In the same way I respect any other Christian whether he be a Baptist deacon or a Presbyterian elder. I don't think my regard for the office would blind me to any defects or blemishes in the character of a bishop. I may say the same of all others in our church, whether they be officials or merely private members. And therefore I say to those friends that when they believe that this is an allusion to water baptism, ninety-seven out of every hundred of these witnesses who testify thus, assume that it is Jewish Proselyte baptism that

Paul alludes to in Rom. vi, 4—an opinion that Baptists and disciples wholly reject. Now of what value is my opinion, if it is based wholly on an error? You say the only fact, on which they based their opinion, was not a fact—it did not then exist. Probably baptism in the fifth and later centuries, “was by immersion, though not always,” (Castell, Pocock, etc.) and these men held this form of it to have existed before Christ. As you reject their only support, you destroy the value of their testimony and have no support. Of all the witnesses Dr. G. introduces to support his views, an average of ninety-seven do not believe with him on *baptidzo*, but with me. I readily grant that in the dark ages of superstition, the Jews in baptizing Gentiles, immersed them up to the neck for hours to soak the Gentile dog out of them and the grace of God into them, as they believed with many heathens that grace was imparted to the water by the Spirit, and immersed them. They did not immerse Jews though, but they baptized themselves by affusion, save in the later dark ages for rare uncleanness, and then never for *mode*—no value was attached to *MODE*, but the object was to wash every part—bring all the man into contact with the water; and dipping was a very convenient way.

We challenge Dr. Graves to the task—HE CANNOT FIND A PLACE IN THE WORLD WHERE BAPTISM WAS PERFORMED *as he and his church perform it, earlier than the FOURTH (4th) CENTURY after Christ*. He cannot find a place where it was performed by a single dip under water, earlier than then. And when *his* way of performing it was first introduced, it caused a split in the church, was denounced as a “heresy,” an “innovation” by the church. He can find in Tertullian, at the close of the second or beginning of the third century, where baptism was performed by *three* dips, attended with anointing, giving honey, milk, etc., all of which shows how far superstition had overcome the simplicity of the faith, and Tertullian admits they had not gospel authority for what they did. The moment we meet with immersion at all, we meet with it covered all over with superstition and innovation.

How oft must we fight over Romans vi, 4? The Doctor

started off as if he meant a philological argument. The moment we took up the gauntlet, for so many years pressed upon our people, he flies to Jordan, to Enon, and to "buried by baptism into death"—always omitting the last words—never quoting it all, or as it is, as a rule. Note what Paul says is, "Shall we CONTINUE in sin?" No. "How shall we who ARE dead to sin—[notice the *present* tense] live any longer therein? Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized INTO *Jesus Christ*—not into *water*—no immersion here—were baptized into his death?" Notice now the EFFECTS of this. He draws a conclusion—makes a deduction—"THEREFORE we ARE buried [*now*, we *continue* in this state]—THROUGH THE (*taen*) baptisms, [*i. e.* of the Spirit] *into death*." The context sustains this—he *is* crucified—he *is* dead to sin—*is* alive to Christ—all present tense. All Greek Grammars support this.

Here we are baptized into Christ—baptized into his death. Now then, if that is water baptism IT puts us into Jesus Christ. To be consistent, therefore, Dr. Graves must hold that baptism by water is a saving and regenerating ordinance. The effect of baptism into death is to infuse into the recipient a new and spiritual life, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father even so we also should walk in newness of life. Now mark, too, the force of the present tense, "are buried." On the hypothesis of the reference here being to spiritual baptism, the whole matter is clear and congruous to the last degree; but if the reference be to *water* baptism, then they were still under the water. It is in the present tense, sustained by the Greek. Now if it was a literal or physical baptism, then by baptism they were put physically, literally, into Jesus Christ's physical body. That is infinitely absurd. If the buried into Christ be the *effect* of water baptism, it is fatal. Is Dr. Graves prepared to accept the full length of his own principles and to concede this renewing power or efficacy to water baptism? It has been already shown that different countries have had various methods of disposing of their dead, and the Greek word applies to *any* disposal of the dead—on funeral piles, scaffolds, in caves, etc., or left on the ground. Thus, Jeremiah xxii. 19, has this con-

cerning Jehoiakim the son of Josiah: "He shall be buried with the burial of an ass, drawn and cast forth beyond the gates of Jerusalem." Now here a man is said to be buried without any covering being implied whatever, but left to decay where dogs and vultures could prey upon him.

And then this same expression, "planted in the likeness of his death." what does that mean? Assuredly it does not necessarily imply a covering over. Sometimes when you plant a thing it is covered up, sometimes it is not. "We shall be in the likeness of his resurrection." Now if we are planted into death, if we are also buried into death, are we always under the water, always buried? No, sir, all this bespeaks the effect of spiritual baptism, this it is that puts us into Christ. Thus you see, from this text, no argument can be adduced in favor of immersion. The action there is not water baptism: this is not alluded to at all. Now Beza says there is no allusion to immersion here. In his commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, i, 5, he also says: "the other is spoken (*aquae effusae*) of the water POURED by John upon the people." He held that John's baptism was by pouring. And Territinus, Witsius and the fathers of that day, use the word primitive, in contrast, with "apostolical." They mean by *primitive* the church after the apostolic age. It is necessary to dive deep into those old fathers, else we misunderstand them. It is evident that he misunderstands those fathers. Beza, Vosius, Witsius, Suicer, etc., held that *baptidzo* meant to *wash* in *any* manner and that effusion was the Bible mode—that on Pentecost, in the house of Cornelius, the jailor, were all baptized by effusion, as their writings in my hand show.

Now, then, we have answered all these points. He has reviewed his arguments in regard to John's baptizing at Enon, near to Salim. We have shown just and scriptural reasons for John's going to Jordan—for Philip and the Eunuch going down (*eis*) to or into the water, in the Bible requirement for "running water." He has not met—he cannot meet those facts or break their force. Why, in our day, with no such laws, we select locations for our own camp-meetings, where there is an abundance of pure water.

Round Lake was selected for this very reason, because there was much water there. But it was not for immersion **that** it was needed, for they do not immerse there much, but still they need much water, as must be obvious to you all. We have to secure a place where there is much water, when we have a ten days' meeting only. We can account for John's coming to the Jordan on rational reasons. Dr. Graves, in his introductory review of Stuart, p. 15, says: "These ceremonial washings were immersions."

Dr. Gale, A. Campbell, Carson, Cox, Ingham, all do the same—all immersionists.

There, then, you see that he maintains that the ceremonial washings were immersions. Now the laver which we know furnished the water for these ceremonial purifications, was so constructed that it was a physical impossibility to immerse or be dipped in it. It was a large basin, whose topmost edge, as we have shown you, was twenty-one feet from the floor. This was an arrangement purposely adopted for the purpose of placing it beyond the danger of contact with aught that might pollute it. For, had anything that was unclean only touched its water, the whole of its water would have become polluted, and in consequence would have had to be emptied out, and the laver purified (Num. 31, 23; Lev. xi and xv,) before it could have been used again. Then Josephus uses the word "sprinkle," interchangeably with "wash" here. Then we find that in the days of John, baptisms were always performed by affusion. John, speaking of his own work as in contrast with that of the Christ, whose harbinger he was, says: "I indeed baptize you with water." Now, how would they understand that? They would understand it in the same sense in which they had used the term ever since it had been instituted and observed for fifteen hundred years. When Dr. Graves gave us his views on the declaration of John, that Jesus should baptize them with the Holy Ghost and with fire, he explained the *fire* as relating to *hell*. The words of John, if paraphrased in accordance with Dr. Graves' interpretation of them might be thus rendered. I will baptize you with water—he will baptize you with the Holy Spirit

—but it will do you no good, for then he will send you down to hell, the last one of you! Who is crazy now, Dr. Graves or Greville Ewing! Dr. Graves lays great stress on their coming up out of the water, and makes *en* to mean *in* instead of *with*. But even the fact of their having been *in* the water is no evidence whatever of their having been immersed in it. It is recorded in the book of Joshua, that the children of Israel “stood still in the Jordan,” but they certainly were not immersed in it, for in the bed of the river where they stood, there was no water at all. Mr. Campbell thought he had found one or two cases where *apo* means “out of” the water. But he utterly failed to establish this fact, and all scholars, Conant, Anderson, the Baptist Bible, at last abandoned the theory entirely. It is never said of Christ, therefore, that he “went out” of the water. Immersionists have had to abandon that interpretation of the term, which they had relied on to prove that he did come up “out of the” water. I am perfectly willing to believe that Philip and the Eunuch went into the water, but I see no reason for supposing that they were immersed in it, as M. Stuart, Baumgarten, Bloomfield also agree, and many others.

How did the Pharisees and Jews (Mark vii, 3-4,) immerse themselves? They could not have done so by making use of the cisterns which had been constructed to hold water for family use: For, if a man had immersed himself in them, he would have had no more water that could be used for his purpose of purification, drinking, cooking, or any purpose, for the space of three or four months. But it is certain that they were not subjected to such a deprivation as this, for we are told (Mark vii, 3-4,) that “the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders. And when they came from the market, except they wash, [baptize—*baptisontai*] they eat not. And many other things there be which they have received to hold, as the washing [baptism] of cups and pots, brazen vessels and of tables.” Now, here the Pharisees baptized themselves every time they came from market, and the Jews would not eat without first baptizing themselves. And besides

this, they had other superstitious reasons for these washings or baptisms, which were of more than daily occurrence, and these could not have been performed by immersion, as a new cistern of water would be needed at every baptism. Now, nothing is more easy than to see how a people, thus familiar with, and inured to, this kind of ceremonial observance, would understand the words of John. When he said "I baptize you with water," they would promptly understand that, as baptism was always by affusion, so it continued when the same word was used. We saw where one man baptized with hail—little particles of hail.

Now, let us glance at the meaning of the term *primary*. According to Webster, it means, *first, in order of time, original, radical*. But according to Dr. Graves, the *primary* meaning is the *current* meaning of a word, the most common meaning in which, whether in writing or speaking, the mass of the people commonly employ it. According to my understanding of language, the primary meaning of a word is the meaning which it had at first, the earliest meaning which we can trace in the use of the word. In my sense of the term, *primary*, as applied to the meaning of a term, is the first in historical order. Now, nothing is more clear than that the original or primary meaning of *baptidzo* is to sprinkle. I willingly concede that it did afterwards come to mean *immerse*, but this certainly was not its original or *primary* import, nor its leading one—and dip was not a meaning at all. Nay, this we proved by the best lexicons in the world. We proved it by an appeal to seven or eight of the greatest and most learned immersionists that Europe and America could produce during the last three centuries. We proved it by an appeal to classic usage, and found the facts to be overwhelming. We proved it by the *universal law* of all Semitic and Aryan languages—the only ones with which the Bible or we are concerned. We *demonstrated* it to be contrary to *all* the laws of language to travel from immerse or dip, to pour or sprinkle—wash or cleanse, intoxicate or drench, overwhelm or overflow. We showed, from a host of examples, elaborated, that words properly to immerse, primarily meaning to

immerse or dip *never*—no, *in no instance* ever came to have the meanings *baptidzo* confessedly has. But I showed also that of over *fifty* words, the *universal* law of all languages is to intensify as they go—expand meanings, and the words meaning primarily to sprinkle, to moisten, where it was by affusion, came to mean all that *bapto*, all that *baptidzo*, yea, all that *tabhal* means. Hence, being backed by such facts, *then demonstrated as accurately as a mathematical problem, it CANNOT BE WRONG. Sprinkle is the primary meaning of baptidzo, and its prevailing, current usage was affusion, always so, when used by Jews, up to the commission.*—[*Time out.*]

DR. GRAVES' SEVENTH SPEECH.

[Replication.]

MR. PRESIDENT:—I really, for the first time, became a little shaky when he made that assertion that “with one fell stroke, he was going to annihilate me.” I let my brother here sharpen my pencil! Now, what was the point he made, that was going to be so damaging to my side? It was this: “That every one of us was baptized by the Spirit at the same time.” Thus the dark storm broke in its harmless fury, and swept not so much as a leaf from the trees. I never heard such a fearful threat before. Unless I expose this fallacy of this favorite position of my opponent, as it is of sprinklers generally, every time he brings it up, it may be claimed by his friends, and the casual reader of the book, that it has not been answered, therefore, I meet it again right here for the last time.

He appeals to 1. Cor. 12, 13, in support of his assertion. Now, will the reader read this passage:

“For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether *we be* Jews or Gentiles, whether *we be* bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.”

Literally “*En henì pneumati,*” in one spirit we have all been immersed into one *body*,” and this body, as every one who will read the chapter can see, is the *visible church*. Baptism is the rite by which one is formally united to the church. So Elder D.’s Discipline teaches, and in this, all creeds agree and can justly appeal to John 3, 5: except a man be born of water as well as the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God—which is here the visible church—something on the earth. See verse 12.

This position is demonstrable, for it is evident that whatever baptism this was, it introduced the recipient into the visible church of Christ. He says that the body here is the

church on earth. But every intelligent Bible reader knows that the baptism in the Holy Spirit, occurred but on two occasions, viz., at Pentecost and at the house of Cornelius. That it did not introduce any one into the body of Christ, is evident, from the fact the apostles and disciples, in Acts 2, were already members, and Cornelius and his family afterwards were baptized, to be introduced into the church. This passage then, cannot allude to the baptism in the Spirit, and therefore, must to water baptism.

3. And he says, with as little reason, and against the critical authority of the world, that Eph. 4, 5, also refers to spiritual baptism. Then the Quaker is right—there is no water baptism binding upon the church, for there is to-day but one baptism, or, as I have shown, one immersion, as the word *baptisma* signifies. Mark how univocal the principles of Christianity. “There is only one Lord, and one faith, and one immersion, and one hope and one body,” or church. The one immersion is the profession of the one faith in the one Lord, and introduces the subject having the one hope, into the one body, or church of Christ. Dr. Barnes, (see notes *in loco*,) denies that this refers to the baptism of the Holy Spirit, as do the best expositors.

There are a few other things I wish to dispose of before advancing with my argument.

4. After all that has been said about Mr. Ewing, I wish you to know how the sober scholarship of his own church regarded him and his position on *baptidzo*, and I wish to apply the remarks of the Review with all their force to my opponent:

PRESBY. REVIEW.—“We cannot but regret, therefore, that Mr. Ewing should have been guilty of so many gross and glaring blunders in his endeavors to make out a case in favor of sprinkling. We have rarely met, for example, with a more weak and fanciful piece of reasoning than that by which Mr. Ewing would persuade us that there is no allusion to the mode by immersion in the expression, ‘buried with Him in baptism.’ This point ought to be frankly admitted, and, indeed, cannot be denied with any show of reason.”—Vol. i., p. 531.

I add this testimony to the host of Pedobaptist authorities, I brought forward in my last speech, and I close my proof on this point—that Paul, in Rom. vi, 4, does refer to water

baptism. Indeed, it ought to be admitted by Elder D., for it cannot, with any show of reason, be denied.

But he says: Paul uses the plural *baptisms* in 1. Cor. 9, 10. Granted. There never had been immersions by different persons, previously discussed, as the immersion or baptism that John administered, and those administered by the disciples before the death of Christ, and the baptism of the apostles after the ascension of Christ, and the baptism of Apollos, (Acts xix,) and of Peter, and of Paul, and the baptism in the Holy Spirit which had occurred to be repeated no more. All questions respecting the relative value of these baptisms, needed no longer to be considered—they had been sufficiently discussed and settled, so they should go on.

4. He told you that ninety-seven out of every hundred commentators affirm that it was Jewish proselyte baptisms that Paul alluded to in Rom. vi, 4! He has not produced one standard expositor who does so teach, and he can find but one or two modern controversialists who do so teach: mark if he does.

5. For the sake of a little present effect, he challenges me to find an instance, before the fourth century, of a baptism as Baptists now administer it—by a single immersion. This is like his previous assertion, that in all the classic writers, where *baptidzo* put one under the water, it invariably destroyed life. But he cannot tempt me to run off into a historical discussion. I meet his challenge with the baptism of John. I meet it by the baptism of the disciples, acting under the eye of Christ. I meet it by the invariable practice of the apostles. I meet it by the invariable practice of the New Testament churches. I meet it with the universal practice of the apostolic churches, down to the time of Tertullian, who is the first to inform us that those churches that finally fell away into the great apostacy, commenced to practice three immersions, which Tertullian is careful to tell us is more than is to be found in the Scriptures. It was this apostate party that, at this same time, introduced, with other rites, as salt, chrism, and exorcising the devil, the practice of infant baptism.

6. Strange to say, he returns to Rom. vi, 4, and emphasises

the English version, "We *are* buried," and says *they* were all then, when Paul wrote this, in a buried state, and if it refers to water baptism, then they were all then under water, and remained so while they lived.

I think once answering a position is enough. Need I say again, that he knows as well as I do, that the verb here is in the Aorist, which is a past tense, and should be rendered as Conybeare and Howson do, and all critics, "Were buried with him by baptism." I will say distinctly, that no *Greek* Grammar will support him in his translation and assertion.

Touching Beza's opinion as to whether the allusion is to water baptism in Rom. vi, 4, I will notice when he produces Beza's language in his own words. *Beza* thought that *baptidzo* signified to immerse, to dip, and *never to wash, except by a figure.*

8. He affirms that "Vossius, Witsius, Suicer, held that *baptidzo* means to *wash in any way.*"

Suppose they did, *to wash* does not mean *to sprinkle*, far from it. But I know that Elder D. mistakes and misstates what Beza says. Here are Beza's words:

"*Neque vero, baptidzo significat lavare, nisi a consequentia.*"

Which I translate: Neither indeed does *baptidzo* signify to wash, except by consequence—[i. e., by the figure of speech, called metonymy, where the effect is put for the cause].

He could not have elsewhere said that *baptidzo* properly means to wash in any way, for he says explicitly it never means to wash at all, except by consequence.

In his Letter 2, to T. T., as quoted by Ingham, Hand Book, p. 90, Beza says:

BEZA.—"But *baptidzo* signifies to dip, since it comes from *bapto*, and since things to be dyed are immersed" (On Matt. iii. 13). He admits that some have disputed respecting immersing the whole body in the ceremony of baptism; but he maintains that "there is no other signification of the verb *hamad*, which Syrians use for baptize." "It answers," says he, "to the Hebrew *tabal*, rather than *rachatz*" (on Matthew) Elsewhere he says: "Christ commended us to be baptized; by which word it is certain immersion is signified."—*Let.* 2nd to T. T.

That you may see how well Vossius sustains Elder D.'s position. I will read:

VOSSIUS.—"In our baptism, by a continuance under water, the burial

of the body of sin, or the old Adam, is represented. The similitude consists in this: That as a corpse is overwhelmed and pressed by the earth, so, in baptism, a man is overwhelmed in water." &c.—*Dispu. de Bap.*, dispu. iii., thes. 4.

Again:

"That John the Baptist and the apostles immersed persons whom they baptized, there is no doubt."—*Dispu. de Bap.*, *Disp. i.* § 6.

He says that charity alone compels us to retain sprinkling in our churches! Turrentine's maxim is ours—"The appointment of God is to us the highest law, the supreme necessity."

Nor do I understand that Witsius sustains him, but quite the contrary. Let one or two quotations suffice to show this. Referring to Romans, he says:

WITSIUS.—"Immersion into the water represents the death of the old man, in such a manner as shows that he can neither stand in judgment to our condemnation, nor exercise dominion in our bodies, that we should obey his lusts."—*Econ. Fæd.*, l. iv., c. xvi.

Again:

"It cannot be denied, that the native, signification of the words *baptizo* and *baptidzein*, is to plunge, to dip."—*Econ. Fæd.*, l. iv.

Had this learned and candid scholar lived in this day, he would have learned that Elder D. can deny it, day after day, though he can bring no proof to sustain him.

Suicer sustains him just as Vossius and Wetstein do.

Other points in his last speech, I may notice in my next, as I wish to advance my argument before my time expires.

He shall not complain of me, as he did of Conant and A. Campbell, that I have little or nothing to do with the Bible in this discussion. I intend to make it "the man of my counsel, the lamp to my feet, and the light to my path in this controversy. I say to you again, it is with this Word first and last of all we have to do. If Elder Ditzler made one impression stronger than another upon you this morning, it was that it is a most difficult, if not an impossible matter for the most renowned scholars of earth to ascertain what the simple term *baptizo* means in the Commission; that they do not agree among themselves, nor even with themselves, believing it means one thing one year, and convinced that they were mistaken the next; giving one definition this year and another

the next. What, then, about the common people who have only the simple word of God? How are they to know anything about their duty, since scholars cannot tell them? He even affirmed that the *Greek of the New Testament cannot be learned from its meaning in classic Greek or from classic lexicons!* If this is so, then no man on earth can understand *any* part of the New Testament to-day, to say nothing of *baptidzo*, and no man since the death of the last apostle has understood any part of the New Testament. Scholars know no more than the most unlearned. The New Testament, then, was not given in a language known to earth, for all can see, if the New Testament was not given in the Greek that can be interpreted correctly by the standard lexicons of the Greek, then Greek scholars, no more than the ignorant, can know what it means. The Holy Spirit should have given a lexicon of the Greek of the New Testament, and failing to do this, the New Testament, according to Elder Ditzler, is a book in a tongue unknown to this world, not a revelation of Jesus Christ, as he declares it to be. It is the untenable *system* which Elder Ditzler represents, that forces him to take such an *irreverent* and *absurd* position. There is no foundation whatever for it, and I demand of him, if he presumes to re-affirm it, that he bring forth some respectable authority to support it, and I promise him and you that when I come to my argument from the classic Greek and lexicons I will meet it fully. He keeps fully three days ahead of me when it is his duty to *follow* me, and I prophesy that when I get to his lexicons, and Greek and Syriac, he will fall back four days behind me, trying to do the work he should do to-day. I now advance in my argument in direct support of the proposition.

The Argument from the Commission.

After Christ had risen from the dead, he met his eleven apostles by appointment in a mountain in Galilee, some sixty miles from Jerusalem, and then he enlarged the commission under which they had been preaching and baptizing. Prior to this, they had been commanded not to preach beyond the confines of Judea, into a city of the Samaritans they must not enter; but from this time onward they were to preach the

good news of his kingdom to the ends of the habitable earth and establish churches to which the doctrines and ordinances were to be delivered by the apostles as they had received them from the Head of the church.

It is with this Commission, with its special enactments, that we have to do in determining this question, and our personal duty. What did Christ command his apostles to do? is the question. Will any one who has respect for Christ or his word intimate that there is anything indefinite or ambiguous connected with this word *baptidzo* any more than about any term or word in the language in which he instituted the other ordinance of his church—the supper? Notice these words: “Jesus took bread and brake it and gave it unto them, and said ‘*labete, phagete, touti esti to soma mou.*’” Is there anything ambiguous about these terms, translated according to their primary and obvious meanings, *take, eat*, this is my body? Not the least. There is not an accountable being so illiterate as not to understand these words and the acts to be performed as readily as the best scholar. But take these words and manipulate them, as Elder Ditzler did *baptidzo* yesterday, and the common people would be thrown into confusion and doubt. Webster gives forty definitions of *take*, and among these “to comprehend,” “understand;” and he gives six meanings of “to *eat*,” and one of these is “to *believe*.” Now, what would you think of the man, though professing to be an expounder of God’s word, who should stand up and teach you that all you need to do is to contemplate the elements, take them in with your eyes, and understand them, devour them with your imagination, and believe on them, but not literally take them in your hand and eat them physically?

And yet, strange as you may think, this form of observing the supper is actually practiced in a “liberal!” church in Boston. But is it any more strange or sinful thus to deal with one of the positive ordinances of Christ than another? May *mathetuo* and *baptidzo* be thus treated, translated by some secondary or metaphorical, far-fetched and *unnatural* significations, to the like perversion of the true meaning, as such meanings must distort and pervert it? Who, under the heavens, should dare

to stand up in the name of Christ Jesus and translate the terms of his plain, positive command by secondary, unnatural, figurative and fanciful definitions?

The inexorable law for the interpretation of all languages is, that the literal, which is the primary and obvious meaning of any and all terms, must be taken, unless the context forbids it, and then, and then only, must the secondary meaning be sought.

Now, I ask at the outset, can we have the moral right to suppose that the least ambiguity attaches to this law, to any term or phrase of it? To make such a charge against the laws of this State would be to charge the law-makers with imbecility and ignorance, or wilful dereliction of duty. But Christ, the Divine Son of God, is the author of this law, and he is Allwise and Omniscient, and if this law is ambiguous in any feature of it, then is it not only not binding upon the race, but Christ has forfeited all claims to the respect of the world, not only as a law-giver, but as a savior, since he must designedly, like the tyrant Gracchus, have mystified his law that the people might be thrown into doubt and uncertainty, and so violate it and become obnoxious to the penalty.

Mr, President, I wish to impress this one fact upon the minds of all who hear me this day, the *form*, the *specific act* or acts to be performed constitute the rite, and therefore the term selected to enjoin it must necessarily be a modal term—*i. e.*, a word of *specific* and not of *generic* or general signification. This, I think, must be self-evident to every thoughtful mind. If Christ did not use a modal word, but selected one having diverse and opposite significations, and therefore ambiguous, to express the action of baptism—a term that the common people cannot understand and the best scholars of earth cannot agree about, then it is evident that no one can know of a certainty whether he has obeyed the law or not, and this very ambiguity releases the world from attempting to obey it.

ILLUSTRATION:

If the officers and courts of this State could not determine the rate of taxes which the Legislature attempted to fix, then

no taxes would be paid until the Legislature met again. I therefore agree with one of the world's greatest philologists:

"To obscure the word that describes the form [baptism] is, therefore, to obscure to the mind of the recipient the nature of the rite, the specific ideas symbolized in it, and the obligations to which it binds him."—*Comment.*

Whenever I violate this law you may all know that as a man and a scholar, I am conscious that I cannot sustain my position by the just laws of interpretation and fair argument, and I think I should be called to order. I do affirm that this Commission of Christ, though one term of it is untranslated, is as easy to be understood, when taken *in connection with Christ's baptism*, as the command to "take and eat" is, when read in connection with the history of the supper. I stand here not to make it plainer, but rather to show in how many ways its Scriptural signification can be indubitably demonstrated.

Mr. President, I will read the Commission:

"Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.—Matt. xxvii, 19-20.

Mark records it thus:

"And he said unto them, go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."—Mark xvi, 15, 16.

I submit it to you, Gentlemen Moderators, and to this intelligent audience, if I am not compelled to interpret the terms of this commission in their literal, most obvious, and most usual signification; and if they are so translated by any one, have we not a right to say the specific requirements of the law are as easily to be understood as those in which Christ instituted the other ordinance? And I ask you all once more, with an emphasis, ought not and will not any attempt on the part of either Eld. Ditzler or myself to translate the simple verb *baptidzo*, which determines the act, by secondary metaphorical and far-fetched meanings meet with a signal condemnation on the part of every fair-minded and Christian man and woman in this house? Now, mark which of us is guilty of such an outrage upon law and language, for it must be in order to mystify and mislead.

Let us not blaspheme Christ by charging him with the sin and shame of having given us a law in terms so ambiguous that the educated, and much less the uneducated, cannot understand. Let us remember that this law was given to the common people, and they are required to understand and obey it. The Lawgiver nowhere requires them to go to the learned, the rabbi or priest, to learn what he meant by the command to be baptized—never. He never required of any mortal to become proficient in Greek and Hebrew, Arabic and Coptic, in Syriac and Sanskrit, and forty other tongues, in order to understand what he meant, and he knew they would and could be only tolerably well instructed in the rudiments of their own native tongue, and therefore, he taught the people in, and the Holy Spirit that inspired the sacred writers, selected such terms as the common people, by the use of their common understanding, could understand without a reasonable doubt as to their meaning.

The proposition I stand here to support from this commission, “which is the only law we have to baptize any one,” as my opponent himself affirms, is this:

IMMERSION IS THE ACT CHRIST COMMANDED HIS APOSTLES TO PERFORM FOR CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

I propose to support this proposition by one main argument, to which all others will be subsidiary.

SYLLOGISM.

I. In commanding his apostles to baptize, Christ used but one pure Greek term, viz *baptidzo*.

II. The literal, primary and most general signification of the word *baptidzo*, as its *usus loquendi* abundantly determines, is to immerse, or an equivalent meaning—and, there being nothing in the context to cause this meaning to be rejected, *ergo*,

III. Christ commanded his apostles to perform but one act, and that act was to immerse.

The major, or first premise, no one denies.

It is the minor premise, the second statement, about which there is any controversy, and this is with but a few men. I rejoice to say but very few men deny this premise, and it is a

matter of profound regret to me that a professed Christian scholar can be found willing to stand up and deny it—a proposition as true and demonstrable as any theorem in Geometry.

My first argument in ascertaining what Christ meant his apostles and his churches after them in all ages to understand by the term *baptidzo*, is,

I. He undoubtedly intended to perpetuate the same baptism that he originally had instituted to be administered by John the Baptist, and which he himself and his apostles, to whom this was addressed, had received, and the very same act which they had been performing by his authority and under his eye, since the baptism of John, for more than three years.

We cannot reasonably suppose that Christ intended to institute a new and different rite in *form*. He intimates no change in the rite, only an enlargement of the field of their labor.

I cannot more forcibly impress this upon you than by our rule quoted from Blackstone:

"To interpret a law, we must inquire after the *will* of the *maker*, which may be collected either from the words, the context, the subject-matter, the effects and consequences, or spirit and reason of the law. (1) Words are generally to be understood in their usual and most known significance; not so much regarding the propriety of Grammar, as their general and popular use. * * (2) If words happen still to be dubious, we may establish their meaning from the context, etc., of the same nature and *use* is the comparison of a law *with laws* that are made by the same legislator, that *have some affinity with the subject*, or that EXPRESSLY RELATE TO THE SAME POINT."—*Blackstone's Com.* vol. 1, pp. 59-61.

Can we doubt the *will* of the *maker* of this *law* of baptism found in the commission? Compare it with the law of baptism made by "*the same legislator*," and administered by his first commissioned officer, John the Baptist. Have they not an intimate "*affinity*?" Do they not "*EXPRESSLY RELATE TO THE SAME POINT*?"

If Christ had designed to change the action of that rite, here is the very place where he should have clearly stated the fact and explained the new action. But not the slightest intimation of any change in the *act*. He does not even name the

element in which they were to baptize, simply because there was no need of it, either for the instruction of the apostles, or of his churches in after ages, with the Gospels in their hands. The apostles knew that they had been baptized *in* water, that Christ himself had been baptized *in* water, and they had for over three years been baptizing *in* water, and they must have understood Christ to command them still to baptize *in* water, observing the same act which he and they had received at the hands of John.

No reasonable man can doubt that this was anything more than an enlarged command to administer the same act for baptism their Master and themselves had received, and which they had been administering to thousands, for years past

Now, I have proved by no less than eight unanswerable arguments, and by the concurrent testimony of a host of the most learned Pedobaptist scholars and divines, that John did immerse his disciples *in* water, and therefore that he did immerse Christ and his apostles.

Again, if one conclusive argument is as good as a thousand, and it is, then I need not utter another word in support of this proposition. I can give Eld. Ditzler the remaining three days, and three years more, and still claim the verdict from every candid mind, that Christ in giving this commission, unquestionably commanded his apostles to still administer the rite in the exact form that he and they themselves had received it, and as they had been administering it to others up to that hour.

You can see that having previously established the act administered by John, designated by this very term *baptidzo*, it becomes the fixed, immovable and indestructible staple, to which the whole chain of argument may with safety be attached.

John administered but one act, and that was immersion, and this *one* act and no other, Christ administered for three years in Judea, and now commanded his apostles to administer to believers in all nations.

My next argument is,

2. If Christ had intended water to have been poured, or

sprinkled or poptized upon the subject, he would have said so. He would have used *cheo*, with a preposition, if to pour. If to sprinkle he would have used *raino* or *rantidzo*, with a preposition. If to wash a part of their bodies, *nipito*. If all their bodies, *luo*; but he never once used one of these, or a derivative or compound of any one of them to indicate the act, but *baptidzo*, a term specific in its signification, the primary and natural signification of which is to immerse, to dip, to plunge. If Christ designed to enjoin the application of water in any way; without specifying the mode, he could have used a term of generic signification, as *kathairo*, without *en* or *eis* before the element, water, meaning to cleanse, to purify, leaving the manner of application with the disciples, and then any application of it would have answered.

3. My third is, had Jesus commanded either sprinkling or pouring, or the application of water in any way, in this commission, the churches in future ages would not have known upon what part of the person to apply the water, whether to the feet, or hands, or head, or inwardly. The law would therefore be null and void, for lack of definiteness. But translate it immerse, and there is no indefiniteness about it—the disciple must be dipped into water, the whole body enveloped by the element.

4. Another and conclusive argument is that Christ commanded the *persons* of the disciples to be baptized, and not the *water* to be baptized on them.

It is claimed by my opponent that Christ enjoined the sprinkling and pouring of the *disciples* as well as immersing them in this command. That it is simply impossible, can be “demonstrated to every mind.”—[*Time out.*]

DR. DITZLER'S SEVENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—Again we will give a few facts on *primary* meanings and on tropical or derived meanings.

In Grimm and Bopp, Fowler's History, English Grammar, Max. Muller's different works, Noah Webster, M. Stuart, the following facts will be found. In some cases "the *ultimate* use scarcely exhibits a trace of the *primal* signification."—N. Webster. "Words thus in current use, sometimes escape altogether from their original meaning."—*Fairbairn's Manual Hermeneutics*, 94. Fowler says:

"The number of radical words in a language is comparatively few, and are chiefly applied to PHYSICAL *objects*. As men found the stock of their ideas increasing, instead of inventing new terms to describe them, they applied old words with an EXTENDED or CHANGED *meaning*; or, what is the same thing, used them *figuratively*. In this way the *great body* of words in a language, in one stage of their history or another, has been used tropically. The word *imagination*, derived from *image* a term applied to its sensible object, was, on its *first* application to a mental faculty or operation, *tropical*. But it CEASED TO BE TROPICAL when it had been used so long that its *secondary* meaning became indissolubly fixed as THE PRINCIPAL one, or, indeed, to most minds, as *its ONLY ONE*. IMAGINATION CAN NOT BE CONSIDERED AS A FIGURATIVE TERM. It has *lost* its *tropical* meaning, at least to the mass of readers, if not to the scholar. What is true of imagination is true of a vast number of words."—*Fowler's "History and Grammar," Eng. Lan.,* § 612, p. 599.

Such are the indisputable facts on language, to which all critics assent without exception. As to the present case, it is indifferent to me which Dr. Graves prefers. If he clings to primaries, then *they* are *not* baptized and we are. If he adopts the *current usage*—*usus loquendi*—which is the true course, we are sustained by all lexicons, all the facts and by the authorities of all ages, and best of all, by the whole Bible.

If Christ had taught that *baptidzo* was equivalent to immerse, there was not a Greek but would have understood the Commission to mean that they were to be DROWNED, and hence would have held him to be insane indeed. Dr. Graves cannot

find a place in ancient classic Greek where a living animal was said to be immersed—put clear under—by *baptidzo* but that it perished. To baptize a living animal in a liquid where *baptidzo* put it under, was to take its life.

As to *baptidzo* meaning to sprinkle, not only do I have the great array of lexicons I gave you, but Pocock, Alford, Lightfoot, Beza, Witsius, Terretinus, A. Clarke, Olshausen, Baumgarten, Fairbairn, Stier, and hosts of others, the mightiest intellects of all ages, and profound scholars—Vossius, Kenoel, M. Stuart, Leigh, etc., all sustain me. I could go on to pile up authorities upon authorities, until you would weary of it.

Why is not Dr. Graves consistent? He piles up commentators to prove that *baptidzo* is to *immerse*. He says it means to immerse. He turns right around and piles them up to prove that it does not mean to *sink*, but to *bury*. He claims a *literal, primary meaning*, then jumps off and fights desperately for a *remote, METAPHORICAL meaning*. Now, sir, you know that bury is a metaphorical meaning, if a meaning at all, of *baptidzo*. No lexicon gives it as a *literal or proper meaning*. Not a single *first-class* lexicon gives bury as *any* meaning of *baptidzo*. It is not a meaning at all. No place can be found on earth where a Greek ever applied *baptidzo* to a burial—NOT ONE. Then it is not a meaning. Yet he clings to this whim as death to its victim.

That Paul does not mean by *one baptism* water baptism, is evident, for,

1st. Heb. vi, 2, speaking of baptism as used in his day—Christian baptism—says “doctrine of *baptisms*”—plural form of *baptisma*. Hence there were *baptisms*.

2d. Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Peter and Christ and Paul bear witness to baptism with water, and baptism with fire as it occurred on Pentecost. Hence Paul, Eph. iv, 4, “one baptism” did not mean to contradict that.

3d. He emphatically shows “by one Spirit (*en*) with one Spirit—we are all baptized into one body whether we be Jews or Gentiles, bond or free.” Here *all* Christians had been baptized by the Spirit.

4th. It means the same, therefore, as Rom. ii, 28-29, “Neither

is that circumcision which is *outward* in the *flesh*, but he is a Jew who is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart, in the Spirit," or by the Spirit. Here Paul declares there is but *one* circumcision—that of the heart. Yet often he calls the outward, circumcision. These facts show our view of Romans vi, 3–4, to be the only correct view. We now come to the VERSIONS.

ANCIENT TRANSLATIONS—SYRIAC.

Both parties naturally agree that the *ancient versions* are infinitely more valuable in settling this question than any other sources of light we can have. The oldest versions were made—the Syriac—in the apostolic age, the *Itala* (Latin) in the second century by the converts of the apostles. Surely *they* knew the force of the words used for baptism—used to translate their idea of *baptidzo* into Syriac, Latin, etc. But these versions are not like lexicons, the expression of one mind, but of *the whole church*. The Syriac was the expression of the knowledge and scholarship of *the whole Syriac church*. The chief of the apostles, and several other apostles, as Thaddeus, labored most successfully in Syria. Christ and his apostles habitually spoke and discoursed in Syriac—called also Aramæan. In a word, all the *most* learned in Syriac and Oriental languages, agree in the following facts:

1. This version is in the language Christ preached.
2. It is the oldest, purest, most literal and valuable version of the whole Bible, known in the world.

I read you from Dr. Judd, quoted by permission by Dr. Graves, in the appendix to his M. Stuart, copies of which they have for sale. On its *value*, Judd, endorsed by Dr. Graves, says, p. 245:

"The old Syriac, or Peshito, is acknowledged to be the most ancient, as well as one of the most accurate versions of the New Testament extant. It was made *at least* as early as the *beginning* of the *second* century—[*John* lived *into* the second century], *in the very country* where the apostles lived *and wrote*, and where *both* the *Syriac* and the *Greek* were constantly used *and perfectly* understood. Of course it was executed by those who understood *and SPOKE* [notice that] *both* languages *PRECISELY* as the *sacred writers themselves* understood and spoke them. * * * All the *Christian* sects in Syria and the East make use of this version *exclusively*."

Now hear how Judd, this eminent Baptist talks :

‘*All the authorities* agree in assigning to this word [*amad*] the **PRIMARY** and leading signification of *immersion*.”—p. 246.

Now *whom* does Judd *first* quote to *prove* this as the **most** eminent lexicographer? *Castell* comes first, Michaelis next, pp. 248–9. He quotes *the very* work that lies before us—not the abridged work of Michaelis, but the one only great edition of 1669—the *Heptaglott*. A few points else, ere we quote him.

There are three words in ancient Syriac literature by which *baptidzo* is rendered—*amad*, *secho*, and *tzeva*.* *Amad* is the one most used. *Secho* is the translation of *tabhal*—*baptidzo* in the lxx, 2 Kings v, 14, *Tzeva* is used for *baptidzo* in the earliest Syriac writings, and Chaldee we have. But *amad* is the most important, as being the rendering in the New Testament *Peshito*. We have the satisfaction of finding places, never yet found by the writers, where *amad* was the translation of the word *louo* wash, proper. It cost us much research of course. In one of the Syriac versions† of Susana, i, 15 and 27, the Greek *louo* to wash, pour, sprinkle, is rendered *amad* in both places. It is a clear case of affusion also.

To see the injustice done here on so important a matter, let us quote Mr. A. Campbell’s Christian Baptism, 135–6. “*Castell* and his editor, Michaelis, Buxtorf, and Schaaf, are all *unanimous*. The first gives the following meanings: “*Ablutus est, baptizatus est. Aphel, immersit, baptizavit.*” He then copies Buxtorff, Schaaf, and Gutbier, and *does not* translate the Latin—not a word of it, and adds—136: “These three [*Castell, B. and S.*] great authorities give to *amad* the *very same meanings* which our twelve Greek lexicons give to *baptidzo* and its family—to immerse, dip, or plunge, and *figuratively*, to wash or cleanse.” Let now the reader glance up at *his own Latin*, and see what a terrible and most unhallowed assertion this is. Is it not astounding that man *can* be so carried away with partisan prejudice? We quote not from Michaelis’s edition, because he leaves off a word, but we quote it *directly* from the great

* *Amad, amad, secho, secha, sechae, tzebha, tyeva.*

† Walton’s Polyglott.

folio work of Castell himself, which lies before us. This lexicon is based on two great lexicons made by *native Syrians*, while the Syriac was yet a *living* language, in the ninth and tenth centuries respectively, existing yet only in manuscript form.

1. "*Amad*, PRIMARILY to wash, (literally to be washed) to baptize. *Aphel*, *i. e.* (*derivatively*,) to immerse, Numbers xxxi, 24. To baptize—(noun form) cleansing, baptism, washing."

"Arabic, *amada*—(same word and same root) to baptize, to make wet with rain."* Under *amak*—"The Arabians also lisp in pronouncing *amak*—*amath*, *amad*, *amat*, to be immersed, bedew, sprinkle with water [or rain] (the earth, herbs, etc.,) sprinkle with water [rain or dew]. A horse wet with water, also sprinkled. Morning dew, also wetting the earth, field, bedewed—sprinkled with dew, (or rain,) wetting (bedewing," etc., page 2800.†

Oberleitner gives wash, cleanse, derivatively (*aphel*) immerse. Not a single Syriac or Arabic lexicon gives immerse as a first, or general, or common or primitive meaning of *amad*.

Catafago—"amad, the being wet with rain." That is the *whole* definition of this lexicographer—a late work. He lived some sixteen years in the very country where the version was made where the apostles preached formerly. He learned to speak Arabic as we do English, and gives us the exact force of the term. But we call your candid attention to Gotch, Judd, and these immersion writers. They put *amad immerse* every time. Judd asserts that "*all the authorities agree in assigning to this word [amad] the primary and leading signification of immersion.*" What are the facts now? Here lies the very book, the very edition he quotes—and there never was but one edition of the

*Prim. ablatus est, baptizatus est.

Aphel, (the *derivative* meaning) immersit, Num. xxxi, 24. Baptizavit, ablutio, baptizatio, baptizatus, lavacrum.

Arab. *Amada* vi, baptizavit. A. madore pluviae affecta fuit. *Amak*,

Syr. Arab. Sam. (violentia impetus.)

†Arabic, et balbulivit in pronunciatione, (*i. e.*, *amath*, *amad*, *amat*,) immer-sus fuit, maduit, rore perfusa fuit (terra, terba, etc.,) rore perfusa. Equus aqua rigatus, et perfusus. Ros matutinus, et terram irrigans. * * (rore perfusus, madenus, etc.—Heptaglotton Ed. Castell, p. 2800.

Heptaglott—and it reads—“*primarily*, to wash—*ablutus est, baptizatus est*, to be baptized, *aphel*, [that is—derivatively, in a derived form] to immerse; and Numbers xxxi, 24 is *the only* place where he can find it with such a meaning, and *no* word for baptize occurs in the original Hebrew or Greek. It is by *such* conduct as *this* they have made such capital out of the lexicons and versions. The Doctor can have the use of my books—take them to his room—examine these matters to the bottom, for I want the facts known. Michaelis puts it *exactly* as Castell does—wash, baptize first, and in a *derived* form immerse. Let us now sum up a few points here.

1. No Lexicon gives immerse as the general or as the primary meaning of baptize in Syriac.

2. All that give it as meaning immerse, put immerse as a derivative, secondary meaning.

3. They could only find one place in the Bible where *amad* meant immerse, and there it was not the translation of *baptidzo*, *tabal* or any word for baptize.

4. It means to wash, to sprinkle, bedew, make wet with rain, moisten, to sprinkle—over and again so defined. The Arabic and Syriac are exactly the same words with same roots.*

5. *Amad* is translated from *louo* in Greek—to wash, pour, sprinkle, but is *never* the translation of the Hebrew or Greek words for immerse—such as *tabha* in Heb., *buthidzo*, *endunai*, *pontidzo*, *kataduo*, *katapontidzo*, or *dupto*, *dip*.

6. The Peshito has John v, 2, 4, 7; ix, 7: “Go wash at (or in) the baptistery.† Here it is clearly expressive of *nipto* as that was the word used in Greek, and A. Campbell renders it “wash, by pouring a little water.”

7. It renders *bapto* sprinkle Rev. xix; 13 (*Zelach*).‡

*Schaaf. Oberleitner. Catafago: “The being wet with rain.” Arabic Lex. *amad*. The old silly ideas that *amad* meant to stand we deem as unworthy of notice. No Lexicon, nor quotation sustains it. A. Campbell justly ridicules it. No Arabic Lexicon gives stand as a meaning either.

†*Dhuktho chedho dh' mamudhitho*.

‡*Zelach*—sprinkle—*aspersit, conspersit*.

The next Syriac word is *secho*, wash. As all define it alike, we need not multiply lexicons.

SCHINDLER.—“*Secho*—Syriac and Chaldee—to wash, be washed, cleansed; because a swimmer cannot swim without washing; [from the idea of swim, then to wash.]—John xiii, 10; 1 Cor. vi, 11; Gen. xliii, 31.

TARGUM.—“And washed his face”—*secho*, * * moistened, (besprinkle) wash.—Ps. vi, 6; Acts ix, 37. *

An examination of the above texts, will show it was all by application of the water to the person—washing the face, as Joseph; washing a dead body as of Dorcas; wetting a couch with tears, as David; Christ washing the disciples’ feet.

The primary meaning is decisive. The root *sacha*, *sach*, Hottenger gives ‘to pour out.’†

The Arabic has it “vehement rain, flow of water.” “*Sacha* to pour out water, to pour forth, to flow down from above, of water, rain, tears; to strike against.”—Castell.‡ Such is the meaning in Chaldee, Syriac and Arabic of the root of the word baptize, wash, cleanse, which translates *baptidzo*, and *tabal*. Is this immersion?

The next word is often rendered *bapto* and in the earliest Syriac literature it is rendered *baptidzo*, and *baptidzo* is rendered by it viz: *tzeva*, *tzeba* or *tsebha*. It is the same in Arabic, Chaldee and Syriac. It never occurs in the Hebrew, notwithstanding Gesenius tells us what it means in Hebrew with his usual facility of knowing *what never exists*. As it is used many times in the Arabic version for *baptidzo* in the New Testament, we reserve the arguments on it for that place, as it means the same in Chaldee, Syriac and Arabic.

The Arabic claims the next place in Oriental versions, because so perfectly allied to the *original* language of the Bible and therefore invaluable to philology. Much more literal, and

*The root is *sacha*, *sach*. *Lavit, lotus, ablutus* fu't: *quia natator non natat nisi lavet*. John xiii, 10; 1 Cor. vi, 11; Gen. xliii, 31. Targum—*Et lavit faciam suam*. Syr. Acts ix, 37; *et laverunt eam*.” Generally, “*navit, natavit*, etc. Hiphil, *natare fecit, humectavit, lavit*. Ps. vi, 6; Lev. xliii, 31,” etc.

† *Effudit*, p. 501,

‡ *Effudit aquam, profudit, defluxit e loco superiore aqua pluvia, lachryma, percussit*. Heptaglotton, E. Castell, 1669. The word comes to mean inundate, also, sometimes.

more valuable, as so much earlier is the *Itala*, but is not allied in any way to Semetic literature. Hence we are not noticing the translations chronologically. The Arabic of the 7th century was made when the Arabic language was in its golden age of philology and science. Aristotle, Plato, Homer—all the finest Greek literature was familiar to them. They had libraries and universities in that and the succeeding century that have been the admiration of the world. They had scientists that spoke as many as seventy dialects.*

The Arabic employs three words to render *baptidzo*—1, *Amad* (amada), 2, *gasala*, 3, *tsavaga* (*tsabaga*, *tsabhaga*.)

1. *Amad* being the same as Syriac, meaning constantly, to sprinkle, wet, as with rain, dew, water, we have noticed.

3. *Gasala*† is the word translated from *baptidzo* and *baptismos*, Hebrews vi, 2, Luke xi, 38; Mark vii, 4, 8—used both for “Christian” and Jewish baptism in Apostolic times and Christ’s day.

Castell thus defines it: to wash, to cleanse, &c. To be sprinkled with water, * * wash diligently, wash off the limbs, wash ourself, &c. To moisten (or bedew), be sprinkled (perfused), to sprinkle.‡ It is not rendered by immerse, dip or plunge by any lexicon

The next word used to translate *baptidzo* is *travaga*, so used between thirty-six and thirty-eight times in the N. T., and often translates *tabal* in the Targums. It is the word in Arabic and Syriac, that like *bapto* and *tabal* sometimes means to stain, color.

1. *Schindler*; *tsavaga*, to moisten, to dip, to imbue or infect with color or moisture (*liquids*); to color, to wash, to moisten,

*See Sismondi Hist, Lit. in Europe; Hallam, Middle Ages, and Hist. Literature, vol. 1 Tarabashi, &c.

†Gasala.

‡Gasala (*Castell*) lavit, abluit, etc., sudore perfusus fuit * * deligenter lavit, perluit membra, se abluit, &c., maduit, perfusus fuit, * * inspergit. It occurs for wash, Ps. 73, 13; Natt. vi, 17, “wash thy face,” Lev. viii, 6, washing Aaron and his sons, Ps. 25; 6; 50; 19, &c., and in Arabic literature where the head is sprinkled, &c.

(sprinkle or bedew;) to wet (or water) to baptize, to immerse.*

2. *Leigh*; same as above exactly.

3. *Gesenius* on *Chaldee*—same where it occurs in Bible in Pual and Ithpaal forms only—"to wet, moisten, to be wet, moistened."†

4. *Castell—Arabic*—"to moisten, imbue, Is. 6, 3, 3, (effected by sprinkling—I have *sprinkled* all my raiment) to immerse, to baptize (by immersion); to pour out; baptism, &c."‡

5. *Furst*, "*tzeva*, to moisten, to wet, (Pual) to sprinkle, to imbue. Ithp. to be wet, moistened.§" In his later German Lexicon, translated by Davidson, it is "*to moisten, to besprinkle, to baptize*. Pual, to water, to moisten." His German shows what he meant by "*tinxit*," as well as "*perfundere*." Where is exclusive immersion now? On the root of this word *tsav*, *tsavav*.

1. Freytag's Arabic lexicon has "to pour, pour out."

2. Kosegarten has: "to pour out, to sprinkle."

3. *Catafago* has: "effusion, pouring out water."

4. *Schindler* and *Castell*, Arabic *tsava*, to pour.

In the earliest Syriac literature we have outside the Peshito, we read of "the baptism of the flood, of martyrdom," "the baptism of tears," of "baptism," either by "immersion, ablution, or sprinkling." Of this we will detail under patristic literature.

While the Itala and Vulgate translate *tzeva* by, once "*to moisten*," twice "*to sprinkle*," † the same word in the *Al Koran* means baptism, and, while applied to baptism, is also applied to the distilling juices of trees, sap flowing from them when

*Schindler: *tinxit, intinxit, colore vel humore imbuit seu infecit, coloravit, lavit, madeficit, rigavit, baptizavit.*

†Gesenius tells us it is dip in Heb. and Chaldee,—*Kal*, form, but as it nowhere occurs in Heb. and nowhere in ancient Chaldee save in *Pual* and *Ith*. where he renders it "wet, moisten"—his assertion is worth nothing unless it was backed by some reason or fact.

‡Tinxit, imbuit, Is. 63, 3, immersit, baptizavit, (per immersionem) effudit, baptismus.

§Furst, tingere, rigare, Pa. perfundere, imbruere, Ithp., tinxit, tinctum esse, Dan, iv; 12, 20, 22, 30: v, 31. Concordentie et Lex. J. Furstio.

†*Tingo, conspringo, infundo*

broken, to the drops falling. Surely this is affusion, not immersion. See Lou. Debate 503. ‡

While Gesenius is careful to tell us it means dip, immerse, in Hebrew, *when the word never occurs a single time in all the Hebrew language*, and to dye, in the Targums, is it a merit after this blunder, to fail to tell us it is one of the leading words for *wash* in the Targums? It not only translates *tabal* but *frequently* translates *rachats* "to wash," "pour." It is the word in the Targum in Leviticus viii, 6, where Aaron and his sons are washed "with water"—*rachats* in Hebrew, while in the Syriac and Targum of Onkelos, it is *secho-wash*. In Num. xix, 10, 19, wash, is *tzeva* in the same, as well as verses 7, 8.

In the Peshito Syriac then we have

1. *Bapto*, the root word of baptize, translated in the New Testament *sprinkle*, Rev. xix, 13, was rendered in 2nd century.

2. *Tabal*, equivalent to *baptidzo*, translated *sprinkle*.

3. *Louo* (wash, pour, sprinkle) translated *baptize*, (*amad*) (*Apocrypha*).

4. *Baptidzo*, rendered *amad*, wash, sprinkle.

5. *Amad* never means immerse, save in a derivative sense, (*Aphel*) and does not thus translate *baptidzo* in the Bible

6. *Tabal* is translated *wash* where the primary meaning is pour, moisten, (by affusion) rain.

7. *Nipto*, applied to very partial washings, to rain once, is translated wash at the baptistery, i. e. it was baptizing.

8. It renders Psalm vi, 6, (7 in Heb.) "I have baptized (*tzeva*) my couch with my tears." What was the mode?

9. Ezekiel xxii, 24: "Thou art the land that is not (*tzeva*) baptized (Eng. purified) no; upon thee the rain has not fallen (*metro necheth*.) Do you know the mode here?

10. Luke vii, 38, 44. Remember that most likely we have here word for word *the very words in the language Jesus used*—for it is his Vernacular, as the English is yours. It occurs

‡ Dr Lindsay quoted in Millen Har, (see Lou. Debate 503) says the same word occurs in Alkoran, chap. 33: 20-21, in the sense of syrup, juice or sap. "A tree produces * * and juice (*sabghagh*) baptism."

twice in the same sense. “Simon, into thy house I come—water upon my feet you gave me not [so runs the Syriac] but she [the woman] *with her TEARS my feet hath baptized!*” “We know the mode. We need no Lexicon. I would not give *one* such witness as *this*, being in the very *age* of the Apostles—in the very language that *Christ* and his Apostles preached in—made in such a language by such men—*universally* received as *true* to the *Greek* when all that membership knew what Apostolic *preaching* and *practice* were. I would not give one such authority for a thousand lexicons, written *fifteen hundred* years after the death of the Apostles, and after the dark ages with their superstitions had rolled between. These facts *crush out utterly* all the little conceits and criticisms about *scatter in drops*—if it is *sprinkle*, it takes *effect* on the *person* and scatters him in drops!! “It takes effect upon the *water* only, scatters it in drops, but *terminates not* on the *person*.” As *brecho* means to wet, moisten, sprinkle, shed forth, applied to rain, tears, dew, etc., and is translated *baptize* in the apostolic age, and takes a direct accusative of the person, so *baptize* in the Syriac—it puts to confusion all these little issues raised by Mr. Campbell and others. It shows the lexicons are correct in their renderings. It shows that we are sustained in our philology—in our rules or canons of interpretation, and better still, it shows that in *our mode* we have *Jesus Christ*, the *Apostles*, and *all the early church with us*.—[*Time out.*]

DR. GRAVES' EIGHTH SPEECH.

Replication.

MR. PRESIDENT:—I will carefully remove the brush he has thrown in to obstruct the progress of those who are inquiring after truth, and I will begin where he closed. I follow him back until I have cleared the entire road.

1. As to whether the allusion is to baptism in Rom. vi, 3-4 that is a settled question by the standard criticism of the pedo-baptist world. Concerning no passage in God's word involving denominational views, is there a more general accord, as the reader can see by referring to my fourth speech on John's baptism. I can afford to have my friend fight out his assertions with Wesley, Adam Clark, Samuel Clark and R. Watson. The fact is, all he has said but makes it the more evident that no mortal man can make any sense out of the first seven verses in 6th of Romans, unless it is understood that water baptism is referred to. If my friend can exorcise the water out of those passages he can express the last drop out of Christian baptism as easily. And he has, when he declares the baptism by the Spirit is still in vogue, for if so, there is no water baptism left.

2. But his assertion that *baptizo* means primarily and properly to sprinkle, and that Alford, Lightfoot, Beza, Witsius, Terrentine, Adam Clark, Olshausen, Baumgarten, and Stier, support him in this position, perfectly astounds me! I have quoted nearly every one of these authors asserting the very contrary. The Elder has certainly become desperate and reckless of his own reputation. Whether he has not made a mistake with reference to the facts in these cases, and the reliance that can be placed upon his last assertions when his cause is in peril, I will leave you to decide when I have submitted what these authors do say. Does Alford, the learned

the most critical of all modern expositors, agree with Elder D. that *baptidzo* means to sprinkle, and is so used throughout the New Testament?

Hear Alford:

DEAN ALFORD.—“The baptism was administered by the immersion of the whole person.”—Gr. Tes. Matt. iii. 6.

“The symbolic nature of baptism is here to be borne in mind: * * the *burial* of the old man, and the *resurrection* of the new man.”—Gr. Tes., on Luke xii. 50.

DEAN ALFORD.—“The allegory is obviously not to be pressed minutely; for neither did they enter the cloud, nor were they wetted by the water of the sea.” “They passed under both, as the baptized passes under water.” “They entered by the act of such *immersion* into a solemn covenant with God, and became His church under the law as given by Moses, God’s servant, just as we Christians do by our baptism.” &c.—Gr. Tes., on 1 Cor. x. 2.

Does Lightfoot sustain him? Of John’s baptism he says:

DR. LIGHTFOOT.—“That the baptism of John was by plunging the body (after the same manner as the washing unclean persons and the baptism of proselytes was), seems to appear from those things which are related of him; namely, that he *baptized in Jordon*, that he baptized in *Ænon*, because there was much water there; and that Christ being baptized, *came up out of the water*; to which that seems to be parallel, Acts viii. 38, *Philip and the eunuch went down into the water*, &c.

If John’s baptism was by immersion, then was Christ immersed and his apostles, and the thousands of disciples they baptized before pentecost, and this beyond a reasonable doubt must have been the act Christ commanded.

Does Beza and Witsius sustain him? I refer to their testimonies which I produced in my last speech.

Does Turretine sustain Elder D? He says:

TURRETINE.—“The word baptism is of Greek origin, and is derived from the verb *bapto*, which signifies to dip, and to dye; *baptizein*, to baptize, to dip into, to immerse.”—Ins., loc. xix., quæ. xi., s. 4.

Does A. Clarke sustain his position? He says:

DR. A. CLARKE.—“They receive baptism as an emblem of death, in voluntarily going under the water, so they receive it as an emblem of resurrection unto eternal life, in coming up out of the water” (Com., on 1 Cor. xv. 29). “It is probable that the apostle here alludes to the mode of administering baptism by immersion, the whole body being put under the water.”—*ib.*, on Rom. vi. 4.

“Baptisms, or immersions of the body in water, sprinklings, and washings, were frequent as religious rites among the Hebrews, and were all

emblematical of that purity which a holy God requires in his worshippers."—Com., on Heb. vi. 2.)

Here Clarke distinguishes between baptisms and sprinklings—and admits that baptisms were immersions, and thus this great commentator of his own church is flatly against him, and Bishop McTiere declares in his Manual that Clarke is a true exponent of Methodist faith.

Does Olshausen support Elder D.'s assertion that *baptidzo* means to sprinkle, and that Rom. vi. 3. 4. does not refer to water baptism? He says:

OLSHAUSEN.—"John's baptism was in all probability like Christian baptism, not only in this, that in it the baptizing partly performed the immersion on the baptized," &c. "The one-half of the action—the submersion—represents the negative aspect, viz., the taking away of the old man (Rom. vi. 4); in the other part—the emersion—the positive aspect, is denoted."—Com., on Matt. iii. 1, 16, 17.

"The figurative expression *baptisma* refers to baptism by fire, and involves at once the idea of a painful *going down* (a dying in that which is old), and also of a joyful *coming up* (a resurrection in that which is new), as Rom. vi. 3 shows."—Com., on Matt. xx. 22.

"John also was baptizing in the neighborhood, because the water there afforded convenience for immersion."—Com., on John iii. 22-36.

Do you call this an agreement?

Does Baumgarten agree with Elder D.? He says:

BAUMGARTEN.—"As in baptism, since man is not only dipped into the water, but also comes up again, the fellowship so signified is not merely a fellowship of humiliation, but also of exaltation; not alone a communion of death and the grave, but a communion likewise of resurrection and ascension."—On Acts ix. 1-36.

Does Stier sustain my opponent that *baptidzo* means to *sprinkle* in the New Testament? He says:

DR. STIER.—"The cup points to something that is to be inwardly tasted or experienced; while the baptism denotes the same thing as also overpowering us from without. As the cup points back more to the assigning will of the Father, so there lies in the baptism a hint pointing forward to the not remaining under the water, the coming forth, and rising again," &c.—On Matt. xx. 22.

"Concerning the baptizing of the Holy Ghost, Theophylact rightly said, 'It signifies the outpouring and abundance of the bestowment.' "' "They should now be immersed into the full flood of the Spirit of God."—*Words &c.*, vol. viii., pp. 419-420.

Does Kuinoel say to be baptized is to be sprinkled? He says:

"*To be submerged with the evils with which I shall be submerged. Afflictions and calamities in the Holy Scriptures are often compared to deep waters, in which they are submerged, as it were, who are pressed by a weight of calamities. Hence, TO BE BAPTIZED is to be oppressed with ills, or to be immersed with ills.*"—*Com.*, on Matt. xx. 22.

Does Leigh, his favorite lexicographer agree with my opponent when he expressly says:

"*Baptidzo* * * The native and *proper* signification of it is to dip into water, or to plunge under water."

It is not an improper or unusual signification of *baptidzo*, that should be sought after. Blackstone says that words must be understood in their usual and most known signification. J. Ernesti says, with whom Stuart agrees, that the literal, which is the grammatical and most obvious sense is the only true one.

But as a climax, he mentions Moses Stuart as declaring with him that *baptidzo* means to *sprinkle*!

"1. *Bapto* and *baptidzo* mean to *dip*, *plunge*, or *immerge* into any thing liquid. All lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed in this."

Again,

"But enough. 'It is,' says Augusti (*Denkw.* vii, p. 216), 'a thing made out,' viz., the ancient practice of immersion. So, indeed, all the writers who have thoroughly investigated this subject conclude. I know of no one usage of ancient times which seems to be more clearly made out. I cannot see how it is possible for any candid man who examines the subject to deny this. * * * * *

"*Christian Baptism*," by M. Stuart, p. 51.

I leave the audience to render the verdict.

He again asserts with increased vehemence his oft disproved assertion that there is no example in classic Greek where a living animal, man or beast was said to be immersed, put clear under by *baptidzo* but that it perished! Every scholar knows that I have produced six *unmistakable* cases, and one would be sufficient.

He has so often made this assertion, that I will nail it to the counter just here and dismiss it.

1. My first case was that of Aristobulus, whom his associates

were bribed to put to death as if in sport in a swimming bath.

The text reads:—Continually or frequently pressing him down, and immersing, (baptizing), him they finally suffocated him.

If one baptism would have destroyed him, why was the immersion repeated?

2. My second case was that of the soldiers on the sea of Galilee, being submerged—(baptized) along with their vessels; those that rose to the surface were dispatched, &c. Why dispatch them, if *baptidzo* put them to the bottom to remain?

3. My third case was the 30 Ex. of Conant, where the author of a work on Epidemics describes a diseased person, “as breathing as persons do after having been—*bebaptisthai*—immersed.” How could any one tell how a person breathed after having been immersed, if the immersion invariably destroyed him?

4. My fourth example was the 59th of Conant, where the cavalry forces of Xænatas baptized—*baptidzomenoi*—and sinking in the pools were all made useless and many perished. If *baptidzo* effectually destroyed, why did any survive?

5. My fifth example was the 64th of Conant, where the charm to cure frightful dreams is given.

“Call the old enchantress and—*baptison*—immersing thy self, *cis thalassen*, in the sea, spend a day sitting on the ground.” If the immersion would have destroyed him, how could he fulfill the second part of the direction—sit a whole day on the ground?

6. My sixth case was Conant's 66th Ex.: When, to free Agamemnon from his inordinate desire, he *baptison*, immersing himself in lake Copais. I have thrice or more times asked my opponent if the King did not go from that immersion, to the siege of Troy. These six are as good as sixty. His assertion is utterly false. I grant that *baptidzo* is often used of ships sinking to rise no more—and of animals when they were drowned, but the great Schleusner says that in the sense of to drown, it is never used in the New Testament, and Vossius agrees with him in this. This is my final notice of his assertion.

The first fact he mentions is new to no one, and does his position no good; *i.e.* "that words sometimes change their meanings and escape altogether from them."

My opponent has again fled for refuge into the Syriac and the versions, where, if he sees fit, he can remain until I reach the versions some days hence in the due course of my argument.

Argument.

I will resume where I closed yesterday on the Commission. My plan and purpose has been to make a symmetrical argument. I will, therefore, proceed in the course I have marked out for myself. My opponent has again fled before me one or two days, and taken cover under versions, but I shall not on that account deviate far from the course I have prescribed for myself. I will again read the commission as recorded by Matthew :

"Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

Mark records it in nearly the same language:

"Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned."

This is *the* law; and the only law for Christian baptism. It is couched in unambiguous terms. Now, we cannot suppose that Christ, after fulfilling all righteousness, "by submitting to the rite which his harbinger administered, intended to supersede this by instituting another of a different character. He does not intimate any change; he uses the same *word*, designating the same *act* John performed in Jordan. The only change is in extending the commission to "all the world" —to all nations and tribes instead of restricting it "to the lost sheep of the House of Israel." Now, let me read to you the canon of Blackstone with regard to the interpretation of law:

"To interpret a law, we must inquire after the *will* of the *maker*, which may be collected either from the words, the context, the subject matter, the effects and consequences, or spirit and reason of the law. (1) Words

are generally to be understood in their usual and most knowing signification; not so much regarding the propriety of grammar as their general and popular use. * * (2) If words happen still to be dubious, we may establish their meaning from the context, etc.; of the same nature and *use* is the comparison of law *with laws* that are made by the *same* legislator, that *have the same affinity with the subject*, or that EXPRESSLY RELATE TO THE SAME POINT."—Blackstone's Com., Vol., I. pp. 59-61.

You see at once its application to the point we have under consideration. It is the same lawgiver who makes this law, who made the first law establishing Christian baptism. It was at first given to be the initiatory rite for admission among his people and into his visible kingdom. This law is for the self-same purpose, and embraces the self-same persons. Do they not both expressly relate to the same subject and to the same point? If Christ had intended to change the *nature* of the act, or the subjects of it, here is just the place where he would have made the alteration. He is but re-enacting the same law, so he deems it unnecessary to make a reference to the *element*.—The apostles knew that Christ had been baptized in water, and that they themselves had been baptized *in water*. They knew that for three years they had been baptizing in water; and they must have known that the command which Christ gave them in his last commission, was a command to administer the same *rite* which he and they had received.

Vattel, in his Law of Nations, p. 65, § 26, note, lays it down as a fixed principle in international law that, "When a custom or usage is generally established * * * it becomes obligatory on all the nations in question, who are considered as having given their consent to it and are bound to observe it toward each other as long as they have not expressly declared their resolution of not observing it in future." In note 10 * * There must be a reasonable notification of any change, or the parties are still bound by the customary law. "This is a natural law that enters into the very nature of things. A previous law is in force until there is an express change of it, and due notification of the fact given." The rite of Christian baptism, established by express law of the only lawgiver in Zion to his first commissioned officer, John the Baptist, to immerse in water all subjects professing repentance toward God, and

faith in Christ, was a law in force in his kingdom until by him repealed, and expressly repealed. But this commission is in no sense a repeal of the law of baptism, but it re-enacts it with but one amendment, and perpetuates it in his church forever; that one change was to extend it from Judea to the ends of the earth.

Yesterday I was delighted to hear my friend extol to the very skies, the preeminent authority of Dean Alford as a biblical critic. Well, I have a special use for his witness upon this point.

“As regards the command itself, no unprejudiced reader can doubt that it regards the *outward rite* of BAPTISM, so well known in this gospel as having been practiced by John, and received by the Lord himself. And thus it was immediately, and has been ever since, understood by the Church. As regards all attempts to explain away this sense, we may say—even setting aside the testimony furnished by the Acts of the Apostles—that it is in the highest degree improbable that our Lord should have given, at a time when He was summing up the duties of his Church in such weighty words, a command couched in *figurative* or *ambiguous* language—one which He must have known would be interpreted by his disciples, now *long accustomed to the rite* and its name, otherwise than He intended it.” *C. m. N. T. in loco.*

Now, I have proved by no less than eight irrefragable arguments—arguments which he has scarcely essayed to overthrow—arguments which his silence has admitted to be unanswerable, and I have corroborated these by the testimony of the most eminent commentators and critics that ever lived, that Jesus Christ, without doubt, received immersion at the hands of John *in* the water of the Jordan or Enon, and that his apostles received the same rite they had administered under the eye of Christ for three and one-half years, and it was this self-same rite that the Christ re-enacts in his commission of the harbinger. Now, conjectures and suppositions however plausible, and assertions, however boldly and frequently repeated, amount not to the weight of a feather in counterpoise with this one conclusive consideration.

In reading this commission, I notice this feature of the law. Christ commanded the *people* to be baptized, and not the water, *i. e.*, the participle *baptizantes*, which has all the force of the imperative here, takes *autous* them—and not *hudos*—water

for its direct object. I am impressed with this fact, that whatever the verb *baptidzo* expresses, it took direct effect upon the persons baptized and not the water. It is the meaning of the word *baptidzo* that we are inquiring after, and it is its *usus loquendi* in the New Testament that I propose to determine.

It is claimed by my opponent, and some few others, that *baptidzo* means, properly and primarily, to sprinkle, and to pour and, if he ever admits that it may anywhere in the New Testament mean immerse, or dip in, when referring to the Christian rite, I have not yet heard it from his lips only that it does not mean to dip.

There is a rule that requires disputants to define clearly the terms they use, and I propose to define, before going farther, the true signification of these terms. Webster will be endorsed as good authority :

To immerse, says Webster, *primarily*, “ *To put under a fluid, to plunge, to dip.*” Figuratively,

“ *To overwhelm, to engage deeply, as to be immersed in business, in cares or sufferings.*”

The subject or object of this act is without division of parts placed under, or dipped into, or overwhelmed by the element, which must be easily divisible in its nature, as fluids or sand,” etc.

To pour, 1. To throw, as a fluid, in a stream, either out of a vessel or into it, as to pour water from a pail or out of it.

Pour is appropriately, but not exclusively, applied to *fluids*, and signifies merely to cast or throw in, in this sense modified by, *out, from, in, into, on, upon*, etc.

It is applied, not only to liquors, but to all other fluids, and to *substances consisting of fine particles.*

Literally, all can see that a solid indivisible body, as man cannot be the direct object of the verb to pour, but only in a figurative or poetic sense, with which *we* have nothing to do. Roy, in his Hebrew lexicon defines it by “*diffuse.*”

To SPRINKLE, Webster says, 1. “ *To scatter ; to disperse : as a liquid or a dry substance composed of fine separable particles as Moses sprinkled handful’s of ashes toward heaven.*”

Secondary meaning, *with a preposition expressed or understood, when it is in fact a compound word*, “ *To scatter on,*” “ *to besprinkle.*”

Whenever sprinkle is used in the sense of purify in sacred Scripture, the *effect* is put for the *means*, as Heb. x, 22.

It will be seen that a *solid body* whose particles are not separable, cannot be sprinkled, but it can only be *besprinkled* with fluid or sand, etc., but, as they are the terms of law before us, we can have nothing to do with secondary and figurative meanings, but with the primary, simple form and sense of this verb.

The verb "*to pour*" is used in sacred Scripture fifty-one times, and in no single instance does God command *men* to be poured. It is used only once in the New Testament. Rev. xvi, 1, "*pour out the vials of wrath, etc.*"

To sprinkle is used nineteen times, and in not one single instance does God command *men* to be sprinkled. Neither to pour nor to sprinkle are once used in connection with, or alluding to baptism. But Christ did command *men* to be *baptized*, and therefore he never commanded them to be poured or sprinkled. The command would be in violation of, and *repugnant* to our natural reason. Men are not divisible; they cannot be sprinkled or poured.

We certainly are not allowed to look for tropical language in the terms of positive law, but terms used in their literal and general signification.

I want every man, woman and child to carry this argument home.

YOU CANNOT SPRINKLE OR POUR A MAN, BUT ONLY WATER OR FLUID OR SAND, OR SOME DIVISIBLE ELEMENT *upon* HIM.

But Christ does not use the preposition in the commission, and no one has the right to add to his word, or to the words of his law, to change it. *He does not command to baptize the water upon persons, but to baptize the persons themselves.* Water is never the object of the verb *baptidzo*, nor is it ever the nominative of the verb in its passive form. Believing persons, men and women, are commanded to be baptized, and not the water to be baptized upon them. Eld. Ditzler cannot parse this commission, and substitute to sprinkle or to pour for one of the

meanings of *baptidzo*. He may attempt to ridicule it, but he should remember the statement of his sprinkling Bro. Geo. Campbell, the Presbyterian.

My next argument is this:

TO CLAIM THAT THE VERB BAPTIDZO HAS DIVERSE AND OPPOSITE MEANINGS IN THIS PLACE OR IN ANY OTHER PASSAGE IN THE SACRED SCRIPTURES, IS TO VIOLATE ONE OF THE ACKNOWLEDGED RULES OF INTERPRETING LANGUAGE.

To sprinkle, to pour, to immerse, to pop *on*, denote diverse and opposite acts, and no word can be coined in any language to express them. If *baptidzo* means *to sprinkle*, it cannot mean *to immerse*. This is self evident, and if it means to immerse, the meaning I have shown it invariably has in the writings of the Evangelists, it cannot mean either to pour or to sprinkle or to pop. We must select *one* and but *one* of these for its true meaning.

My next argument is from the universal adaptibility of the term.

WHATEVER BAPTIDZO SIGNIFIES WITH RESPECT TO THE RITE OF BAPTISM, WILL TRANSLATE IT IN EVERY PASSAGE IN WHICH IT APPLIES TO BAPTISM.

To test this canon and thereby ascertain the true *signification* of *baptidzo* in the New Testament, I propose to examine every passage in the Evangelists, and some others, in which *baptidzo* and its cognates are found, and I do this to determine this vexed question in the minds of the *common* reader, for whose benefit I am most especially shaping this discussion. *It will be seen by him that in every case in which baptidzo is used, it is invariably used in the sense of to immerse, and never in either that of to pour or to sprinkle, to pop, or to stand up, as some claim that the Syriac verb denoting baptism means.*

I open the New Testament at Matt. iii, 6:

1. Matt. iii, 5, 6, 7: "Then went out to him Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were sprinkled, poured, popped, scattered, stood up, (the claimed force of *amad* in Syriac. Some Pedobaptists claim that it means to stand, so I try each passage with *to stand also*,) immersed of him in Jordan, confessing their sins.

Will you decide which of these acts makes sense, remembering that you cannot sprinkle or scatter a living being into fine particles or drops?

2. Verse 11: "I indeed sprinkle, pour, stand you up, immerse you in water, unto repentance, etc."

3. Verses 13, 14, 15, 16: "Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan, unto John, to be scattered, poured, immersed of him; but John forbade him, saying, I have need to be scattered, poured, immersed of thee, and comest thou to me?"

"And Jesus when he was scattered, poured out, stood up, immersed, went up straightway out of the water."

4. Matt. xxi, 25, 26, 27: "The sprinkling, pouring, popping, immersion, etc., of John, whence was it, from Heaven or of men?"

5. Mark i, 3: "John did sprinkle, pour, pop, stand up, immerse, in the wilderness, etc."

"And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all sprinkled, poured, stood up, immersed of him IN the river of Jordan, etc."

6. Verse 8, 9, 10: "I indeed have sprinkled, poured, stood you up, immersed you (*en*, in) water."

7. Mark xi, 30: "The sprinkling, pouring, immersion of John, was it from Heaven, or of men?"

Should I be censured for believing that every one not blinded by prejudice, must be convinced that these two Evangelists at least, used *baptidzo* only in the sense of to immerse?—[*Time out.*

DR. DITZLER'S EIGHTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—*Blackstone* again. I endorse all *Blackstone* says. Usage—current usage is our guide on the meaning of words, but what of *primary* meaning? *Current* meaning is not *primary*, and often does not exhibit a single trace of the *primary* at all, as Webster, Fowler, Fairbairn, Jahn, Robinson, &c., tell you.

1. We saw that classic use proved that sprinkle was the *primary* meaning of *baptidzo* and *bapto* as well. This he has never attempted to meet even by a *feint* of attack.

2. Only thirty times in all can *baptidzo* be found in all the classic Greek literature of the world up to Christ's coming, and the cases can be examined. Certain it is Christ and the Apostles knew not of those—never saw them. Most of them were written just before he came, in remote countries in classic Greek style, in the iron age thereof.

3. By *Blackstone* the literature examined to find an author's meaning at least must be *kindred*, not remote, of a different Greek, yea and tongue. Of what affinity is classic Greek—Polybius, Strabo, &c, with the Bible Greek? *Baptidzo* in Plato is to make drunk, and confuse with questions. In Josephus' Greek, learned from classics, it is to sink, where each submerged object went to the bottom and remains there yet; to burden or overwhelm with calamities, debts, taxes. So Plutarch. In Aristotle it is to "overflow" a permanent, immovable object. In Alcibiades, Aristophanes it is to asperse, pour abuse upon. Now where has *baptidzo* such meanings as these in the ordinance use of it in the N. T.? You know it has no such meanings.

But Dean Alford, that great scholar and critic, is called up, as if he were on his side.

Hear what Alford says in his commentary on Mark vii, 4, and Acts ii, 41: "The *baptismoi*, as applied to *klinoi* (couches at meals) were certainly not immersions, but sprinklings or

affusions of water.” “Almost without doubt, this first baptism must have been administered, as that of the first Gentile converts was (see note ch. x, 57 and note), by affusion and *sprinkling, not by immersion* (*italics his*). So thought Olshausen, Stier and other of the greatest Greek critics of this or any century.

Dr. G. thinks I misrepresent him. He is mistaken. I quoted his book where, commenting on Heb. ix, 10, he says they were the washings, immersions of the law. I read your words then. I certainly never dreamed of you saying or meaning that all the purifications were meant; for these were often by sprinkling blood, and sprinkling of the water with ashes of a burnt heifer—often by this method. But I quoted you as referring to the washings (*rachats—louo—nipto*,) that were for declaring ceremonial cleansing or purity. It will be more to point if he will meet my facts, or show how the people immersed themselves in the light of the numerous facts we have presented. The amount of water—pure, simple water—used for these baptisms, is given the fifth of a pint of water—an egg-shell full—hen’s egg—served to baptize a man. A few particles—“little particles of hail” were sufficient when melted, to baptize. Clemens Alexandrinus, A. D. 190, a learned Greek, says the Jews daily baptized themselves *epi koitae on a couch*—the water was poured on their heads. Josephus, a high priest in Apostolic days, twice uses *sprinkle* for the wash—*rachats*—Greek *louo*—of the Mosaic books, where Aaron and his sons were washed—to which you all, A. Campbell, Carson, Gale, &c., assert *baptidzo* applies in apocryphal and New Testament Greek.

Authority on baptism in fire—this you may produce—a few authorities. But the mass, 98 to *one* are against it. It is supremely absurd to make John say that those he baptized with water, Christ baptized with the Spirit, should be plunged into hell as the effect of a *double* baptism. Let him show where *baptidzo* applies to being cast into hell. *Show a text. It can’t be done, and he knows it.*

Amad, Syriac for baptize. He pretends that I adduced Luke vii, 44, as a case where *amad* was used. I told the

audience plainly that the Syrians used, as the Arabs did, several words for *baptidzo* in their literature. I quoted Judd, the zealous Baptist, and DR. J. R. GRAVES as my *witnesses*, as well as Neander, 1376, Giesler, Hegessippus *and the Syriae itself*. *Tzeva* is rendered *baptidzo* in 2nd, and subsequent centuries. A sect of Christians are called *Tzebians* or *Sabeans* from that word—baptize daily—"Haemero—Baptists." It is the word in the Arabic N. T., made in the golden age of Arabic learning—in an age when they translated Plato, Aristotle and Homer—in *that* age of Greek study some 38 times in the N. T., they render *baptidzo* and its nouns by this word which is used repeatedly for *clear cases* of *sprinkling*—admitted by Dr. Graves to be very light sprinklings. Hence these facts are perfectly crushing. In the Apostolic age *baptize* in Syriac was applied to sprinklings, *never to immersions*—NEVER.

But the thing that most astonished me in the gentleman's speech was that my sprinkle was translated from the Latin *tingo*. He asserted that it was all *tingo, tingo, tingo!!* I am amazed at the gentleman. What does he mean? Where was his hearing? He waits two days—two days have passed since I read the Greek Lexicons, and now he thus hopes to break the force of the mighty array of crushing facts we adduced. Alas! for such a dodge. *In not a single case did I render tingo by sprinkle*. The words in Latin I quoted from Wahl (3rd ed., Wolfius, Vossius, Suicer, Schleusner, Julianus, &c., &c., were *adspergo, conspergo, aspersio perfundo, profundo*—in Greek from Euthymius (4th cent.) and Gages were *rantidzo*, and *epichuno*, i. e., *epi*, upon and *cheo*, to pour, and let him dare deny any of these facts or renderings? Several were English, quoted from Booth and Ingham, both Baptist standard writers, giving sprinkle, pour in English, and we have them here—cited the page. Schneider gives *baptidzo* as equivalent to Greek *brecho* which is such a sprinkling and pouring forth as rain, tears, dew. He knows this. Stokius' words were "*adspergendo aquam*"—by sprinkling the water, and "*aqua adfundebatur*," the water was poured copiously upon the baptized. Will he deny that *fundo* is THE Latin for *pour*? Passow is in German—is not *benetzen, anfeuchten* *moisten, wet*, in German? Is not

bigiessen sprinkle, like Latin *perfuno* and *ubergiessen* besprinkle, sprinkle upon, *uberschutten* pour upon? You must improve your hearing. *We mean business.*

He understands me to say I would not give *one word* of Syriac for a thousand of Greek! Oh! no; nothing like it at all. I said in substance that one such fact as baptize a couch with tears, Christ's feet with her tears, the land with rain, was worth a thousand such authorities as you paraded, or lexicons made fifteen, sixteen and eighteen hundred years afterwards, when the dark ages with their dark burden of superstition rolled between, wrapped in the black folds of a thousand years of ignorance and gloom and blood. Nor would I give one such fact from the Apostolic ages for it all on those points.

On Rom. vi, 4, once more we ask, how can a dip in water represent the crucifixion on the cross? It is useless to repeat till he answers some of my points. I answer all he seeks to make, then offset with irrefragable facts and arguments he even dare not notice.

Again he brings up *apo, from*. Finding that all the learned immersionists of candor now give it up, and that Christ did not go up out of, but away "*from* the water,"—Conant, Anderson, Wilson, Bible Union, he falls back and says "*apo* takes them just where *en* and *eis* put them." But it was Christ who "went up immediately *apo, from* the water," Matt. iii, 16; Mark i, 10. Now *eis* is not used anywhere of his baptism or of his being *eis* in or by the Jordan. It is said Matt. iii, 13: "Then came Jesus *pros* to John *epe* at the Jordan to be baptized"—not in the Jordan. It was *epe* at, not *eis* at, in or by, or into. *Apo* can only apply where the person *was not in the water*, as Winer shows on the Jordan, answering to *epe*, yet 40 feet from actual contact with the water—be *in* Jordan, in Scripture language, as Elijah dwelt *en* by the brook, &c.

I can assure the Doctor that if his friends feel quarter as well over this debate as ours do, he may congratulate himself. Here is Bro. Dockery who can hardly hold in his big soul, he feels so good.

The Doctor abandons "bury" now, and falls back on a word

in the next verse, Rom. vi, 5, "Planted together." What does that mean? Is *plant* a word of definite *mode*, or does it imply *envelopment*? Surely not. Suppose he takes the seed and dips them into the ground and takes them right out again, as they baptize, would *that* be planting them? Suppose it is an *orchard* of apple, peach and pear *trees* he has "*planted*." Do they either dip them into the earth and lift them out, or cover, bury them up, all over as they put the subject under water? Do you not see that this word helps him not, but *destroys* him? Take a few of the passages where *plant* occurs. "Ps. i, 3, Jer. xvii, 8; ii, 31, "A tree planted by the rivers of water." "As a tree planted by the waters." Matt. xxi, 33, "A certain householder which *planted* a vineyard." "I plant thee a noble vine," Jer. ii, 31. *In no case do I find plant in the Bible implying complete envelopment or dipping.* So here he utterly fails in their favorite Scripture.

But what is "*the likeness of his death*" in which we are planted? *Sumphutoi*, planted, is from *sumphuo*, "*born, engraft, planted, grow together.*" By this baptism we "*are engrafted, born, grow together with Christ.*" So Paul says. Does *water baptism* effect that? IS THAT WATER BAPTISM? You insist that as *by the baptism* "we are buried into death," the baptism is the burial. So as "by the baptism" we are planted, that is, "engrafted, born, [of God], grow together" as one with him, and by your position *this is water baptism*!! Verily you go beyond all "*Campbellites*" as you call them; for *this* is water regeneration, water engrafting, water growing together with Christ. All *this* to save the sinking cause of immersion. But again we have primary up. Webster sustains me, as do all authorities, that primary is the first, the original meaning of the word—not current meaning, unless current use retains the original meaning. Webster says "Primary—*first in order of time or development*; original." "Primitive—*pertaining to the beginning.*" So Worcester, Richardson—so all critics hold it. Hence not a single point I have yet made is shaken, nor can be.

He says the *definite*, specific naming of a thing is the exclusion of *all others*. But *that is the very point to prove—where*

has the New Testament used a *definite, specific* word for what you require in baptism. The Greek has words for dip, both partial and thorough dips—*dupto* and *embapto, baptō*—not once are they used for baptism, nor *kolumbao*. In Greek *pontidzo, enduno, buthidzo, katapontidzo, kataduno*, all mean definitely to immerse. Not once is one of them applied to baptism in the Bible. Conant gives *baptidzo* 14 definitions, A. Campbell, supports 20 for it, Mell, Gale, Carson, &c an average as great in proportion to the citations. It is *wash* often. Is *that* specific, definite? Far from it. You wash your face, your head, your body by application of water, and more or less your hands—no *specific* mode being used. You wash furniture, tables, the floor, a child—rains wash our houses, trees, fences, the bushes, herbage, all by pouring. “Half-blown roses washed in dew,” in Milton, are not immersed. *Lavo* in Latin, *louo, pluo, nipto, kludzo, brecho* in Greek, *rachats* in Hebrew, all meaning to wash, mean to sprinkle or pour, or both also—*whenever modal*—are ALWAYS *sprinkle or pour*. *Baptidzo* not only means to wash, but in *classic* use it is intoxicate, make drunk, burden with debts, taxes, overflow, overwhelm, asperse, pour abuse upon—*these* are not definite, specific processes, and *all one specific* thing, surely.

If he falls back on the *current, general* meaning, he fares as badly; for taking *the best showing* immersionists could make, out of an average of four hundred and seventy-five cases they *unitedly* make it dip eighteen times. A. Campbell found *no place* where he could render it *dip*; Ingham, out of one hundred and sixty-nine cases, found *only one* where, in his estimation, it was *dip*. Hence *dip* in the house of its friends, is *the rarest* of all meanings. It means *drown*, far oftener than dip, in the estimation of those who say it *means dip* and *nothing else*! Passow, the greatest of Greek lexicographers says: “*Generally* to sprinkle upon (or besprinkle,) to pour upon.” Then by this authority, assuming Dr. Graves’ idea of primary, we still have the position sustained that *no Baptist is baptized*. If only the primitive is the allowable one, and the primitive means *primary usage*, the most *general* meaning, then *we* are right still, and no Baptist is baptized, save the few who went from us.

And now let me refer to the way all this is sustained by the Hebrew word for baptize—*tabhal* (*taval*). I gave Castell, Buxtorff's folio lexicon, etc. The first embodies full three hundred years of labor, the other thirty years. Here are pains and labor, study, and care. After defining *tabhal* (baptize) by moisten, dip, etc., as formerly quoted, they tell us—Buxtorff—that it “is not washed all over, but *besprinkled* with the water.” Castell, that even when it is *intingo*, dip, “the dipping (*intinctio*) *merely touches the subject to the liquid (water)* either in *part* or in *whole*—(*contingat tantum * * * rem humidam, vel parte vel totam—con* with, and *tingo*, to touch.) Schindler so distinguished also 1612, says substantially the same—“*merely touches the moisture (liquid or water) in whole or in part; baptize*”—*attingat, ad to*, and *tingo*, touch. Leigh has exactly the same. Stokius' Hebrew Clavis, the same—“as it touches the liquid in whole or *merely in part*” (*aut saltem ex parte*.) Here Castell is equivalent to nineteen lexicographers—yea, twenty, as Rabbi David Kimchi is used and endorsed here. In all then, we have twenty-five of the greatest Hebrew lexicographers the world has ever known, supporting us—that if the object “is *merely* touched to”—*merely touches the water—the liquid element, or is touched (ab aqua)* by the water, he is *baptized*. When he is *besprinkled* by it, he is *touched* by it. But then, all these great and famed lexicographers are *crazy*, “crazy as loons,” for they sustain Furst *out and out*.

Schindler was recognized justly in *his* day as Leigh quotes it “*the greatest scholar in christendom*.” All the great witnesses—thirty odd Greek lexicons—all the standards of that language, *twenty-five* Hebrew lexicographers, the greatest on earth; a body of Syriac lexicographers, embracing the greatest of their native lexicographers—Arabic—Chaldee—all, making quite a hundred lexicographers—*every one* sustaining affusion, and *not one* sustains the Doctor's position—*NOT ONE*, and *not one* in seven justifies immersion as baptism in the New Testament, and *no one at all supports dip* as a New Testament meaning of all I quoted. Verily that is a bad showing for a cause as boldly *asserted* as is theirs.

I will now take up his attempt to meet my argument, in his sixth speech.

The Doctor adduces the quotation from Maimonides to meet my argument on the laver. Strange to say, the first sentence he uses is a serious mistake. He says: "In every case of purification when *tavel* [*laval*] is used, I will say *that* was by the immersion of the whole body."

1. Now *taval* is never used of purification in the whole Bible—NEVER.

2. It is not the word for *wash* in Maimonides. Maimonides is thus quoted by Ingham, Baptist, p. 373: "Wherever in the law, washing, &c, is mentioned, it means nothing else than the dipping of the whole body in a laver: for if any man dip himself *all over*, except the tip of his little finger, he is still in his *uncleanness*." "A bed that is *wholly* defiled, if a man dip it *part by part*, it is pure," *ibid.* Let us note now,

1. By this it is granted one *may baptize* himself *without* baptizing "himself *all over*."

2. There is no question as to whether one may not baptize himself by perfusion, but whether *for certain kinds of* uncleanness complete washing was not necessary.

3. It does not make it necessary to dip to be baptized, but if any part is unwashed, he is unclean still.

4. This shows utter superstition; for the writing clearly shows that *mode* was not contemplated *at all*, but that *all parts* must be *touched* by the water, *perfusion* suiting as perfectly as submergence. This appears where the "*bed* is dipped *part by part*." That *utterly* destroys their own dogma. There is clearly no *mode* contemplated as *essential*. Baptists do not "dip part by part" of a man. To dip one end or side of a bed, then the other side, is *not* to immerse it at all in their sense of immersion.

5. This was all in the 12th century, when superstition was absolute; when as Castell, Buxtorff and Schindler show, the Jews kept Gentile proselytes standing in the water for hours, to soak, as they superstitiously thought, the Gentile nature out, while they recited the law, in water "up to the neck."

6. Finally, the words used show *mode* was not contemplated in this purification, the whole being 1200 years after Christ, and without authority, and a pure superstition; too late to give us any reliable dates at all. The first word used is *rachats*. It never means dip, does mean pour. It interchanges with, or is accomplished by *shataph*, (pour, wash,) *tabal*, sprinkle, dip where it merely “*touches the liquid*,” and *kabas*, to wash, *never* dip or immerse. I will give a literal rendering from the original, as few have access to it, and it is not translated that I know of. “Wherever in the law washing occurs, either of the body, (*bashar flesh*) or of the garments, from defilement, (*min*), nothing else is to be understood than the washing (*tab-ilah*) of the whole body at a fountain, [or in a concepticle of water]. And that which is said, [here extra defilement is described], ‘and he shall not wash (*shataph*) his hands with water,’ is to be understood as if he said he must wash (*shita-bul, tabal*) his whole body with water. And after the same order shall other impurities be judged of; so that if one *should* wash himself all over (*tabal kulo*) except at the extremity of his little finger, he is yet in his uncleanness.” This part that shows the washing contemplated defilement requiring a more thorough washing, the immersionists leave out.

Thus we see it is *rachats* Maimonides uses. We see immersion—mode—had no part in it. And this is the best he can do to meet our unanswerable, Bible facts!—[*Time out*.

DR. GRAVES' NINTH SPEECH.

Argument.

MR. PRESIDENT—I will take up my argument from the adaptability of the term immerse, to meet the requirements of the sense in the passages in which *baptidzo* occurs. Let the reader decide which verb makes sense, remembering that solid indivisible subjects like living beings cannot be the direct object of the verb to sprinkle and to pour, without requiring the prepositions on, or upon to be expressed or understood. But *baptidzo* in none of these instances is used with a preposition signifying on, or upon, and therefore it cannot mean to divide and scatter in drops, or diffuse.

8. Luke iii. 3 And he came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the sprinkling, pouring, or immersion of repentance for the remission of sins.

9. Verses 7, 8. Then said he to the multitude that came forth to be sprinkled, poured, popped, immersed, etc., of him, etc.

10. Verse 12. Then came also publicans to be sprinkled, poured, immersed.

11. Verse 16. I indeed sprinkle, pour, pop, immerse you in water.

12. Verse 21. Now when all the people were sprinkled, poured, immersed, it came to pass that Jesus also, being sprinkled, poured, immersed, etc.

13. Luke vii. 29, 30. And all the people that heard him, and the publicans, justified God, being sprinkled, poured, immersed, with the sprinkling, pouring, immersion of John. But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not sprinkled, poured, immersed of him.

14. Luke xx. 4. The sprinkling, pouring, immersion of John, was it from heaven, or of men?

15. John i. 25, 26. Why sprinkleth, poureth, baptizeth thou, then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet? John answered them, saying, I scatter in, pour in, immerse in water.

16. Verse 28. Beyond Jordan, where John was sprinkling, pouring, immersing.

17. Verse 31. That he should be made manifest to Israel; therefore I am come sprinkling in, pouring in, immersing in water.

18. Verse 33. He that sent me to sprinkle in, pour in, immerse in water.

19. John iii. 23. And John also was sprinkling in, pouring in, immersing in Enon, near to Salim, because there was much water there; and they came and were scattered, diffused, immersed.

20. John iv. 1. The Pharisees heard that Jesus made and scattered, diffused, immersed more disciples than John.

21. John x. 40. Beyond Jordan, into the place where John at first scattered, diffused, immersed.

22. Matt. xxviii. 19. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations. scattering, diffusing, immersing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

23. Mark xvi. 15, 16. And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature: he that believeth and is sprinkled, poured, immersed shall be saved.

24. Verse 22. After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judea, and there tarried with them and scattered, diffused, immersed.

25. Verse 26. Behold the same scattereth, diffuseth, immerseth, and all men come to him.

26. John iv. 1, 2. When therefore the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and scattered, poured out, immersed more disciples than John, (though Jesus himself sprinkled, poured, immersed not, but his disciples.)

27. Rom. vi. 3, 4. Know ye not, that so many of us as were sprinkled into, poured into, immersed into Christ Jesus, were sprinkled, poured into his death? Therefore we are buried,

with him by sprinkling, pouring, popping, standing up, immersion into death, that, like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.

28. I Cor. 12, 13. For by one Spirit are we all sprinkled, poured, immersed into one body

29. Col. ii. 12. Buried with him in sprinkling, pouring, immersion, wherein ye also are risen with him.

Let us apply the text to the figurative use of *baptisma* in Christ's allusion to his overwhelming suffering—

I have a sprinkling, a pouring, an immersion, to be sprinkled, poured, immersed in, and how am I straightened until it be accomplished.

Was he but slightly touched, sprinkled with sufferings, or immersed, overwhelmed with them?

These, I believe, are all the texts in the New Testament which have a plain and obvious reference to either the baptism of John or of Christ. They afford us the sum of all the knowledge which we can have of either the mode or subjects of Christian baptism. What these passages say, we may believe; what they do not countenance, we may not believe.

Can any mind not blinded with prejudice doubt for one moment that the inspired writers used *baptidzo* in the sense of immerse, and immerse only? This then must be its only meaning when used in its literal sense.

My next argument is:

Having seen by the *usus loquendi* of the verb *baptidzo* that it is invariably used by the evangelists in the sense of to immerse, and *never* in that of "pour upon," or "sprinkle upon," let us now see in what sense the inspired apostles understood it, and the preachers of the New Testament age.

My next argument is—

THE APOSTLES TO WHOM THE COMMISSION WAS GIVEN, UNDERSTOOD CHRIST TO COMMAND THEM TO *immerse* THOSE WHO SHOULD BELIEVE THEIR WORDS.

It will be granted that they understood what their divine

Master meant when he commanded them to *baptize* believers among all nations. It was the one and self-same act to be observed in all nations, cold or hot, and in all times.

In connection with the church at Jerusalem we have no circumstantial history of baptism; we only know that believing men and women were baptized by thousands. In two revivals, soon after the ascension of Christ, there were eight thousand added by baptism to the church in that city. That they were immersed we *know*, if the primary and literal meaning of *baptizo* means "to immerse," which is the fact I am demonstrating in this discussion. The scarcity of water in Jerusalem, and in the river Jordan, used to be a favorite argument with sprinklers until of late years, when eminent Pedobaptists as well as Baptist scholars have demonstrated that there was an abundance for all purposes, and especially for bathing purposes. No people bathed their whole bodies more often than the Jews; their religion and the traditions of their elders requiring frequent ablutions of the whole body. The millions of the males of Israel who went up three times a year to the city to worship were required to bathe their bodies—immerse them—to prepare themselves for their temple worship. No man who has any respect for his audience or his own reputation as an honest man or a scholar will deny that there was sufficient water in and around the city for the *immersion* of every person in Jerusalem.

It was also common for some preachers to assert that the three thousand added on the day of Pentecost could not have been immersed that day, because there could not have been sufficient time after Peter's sermon to have immersed three thousand. We reply, if the record says they were immersed that day they most certainly were. Whatever sprinklers may say, let God be true. We know of no other way persons were, or can be now added to the church or an organized body of disciples except by Christian baptism and we understand the record to say that they were added that day. There was nothing conceivable to hinder. There was *water* enough: there was *time* enough. The ordinary time it requires to immerse a person now is thirty seconds, or one hundred and twenty in

an hour, oftener one hundred and eighty in an hour, where dispatch is aimed at. There were eighty-two commissioned administrators—*i. e.*, the seventy disciples and the twelve apostles, and, at the lowest estimate, they could have immersed the three thousand in nineteen minutes! We pass this.

The next account we have of baptism is a very circumstantial one.

The Case of Philip and the Eunuch.

Philip was an evangelist, not a layman. We doubt not that he was one of the seventy disciples commissioned by Christ to preach and baptize; if not, he was commissioned by the Apostles or the Church of Jerusalem, for that was an orderly Church. But, upon this occasion, he received a special commission from the Holy Spirit to disciple and baptize the Eunuch. Let all ministers who claim they have a right to baptize where and whom they please without asking the will of the church, because Philip baptized the Eunuch without referring the question to a church, show the same commission from the Holy Ghost that Philip had, and let them remember that all special and personal commissions expired with the individuals to whom they were given.

The narrative is a simple one. Let all turn to Acts and read from the twenty-seventh verse of the eighth chapter to the close: "And as they went along the way they came to a certain water"—*i. e.*, a well known stream or body of water upon that road—"and the Eunuch said, 'see here is water what hinders that I should be baptized?'" In preaching Jesus, and only Jesus, to the Eunuch it seems he had preached the duty of being at once baptized, (very unlike the popular evangelists of this day). The Eunuch giving Philip the necessary evidence of his discipleship, and being accepted, commanded the chariot to stop; and now mark the unmistakable description of the act, "and they both went down into the water (*kata besan amphoteroi eis to hudor*), and, to place the possibility of a mistake out of the question, the Spirit emphasizes by a repetition, "both Philip and the eunuch"—*i. e.*, *went down into the water*, "and he baptized him," *i. e.*, in the water. "And when

they (*anabesan ex tou hudatos*) were come up *out of the water*, etc.

Now, whatever professional controversialists may say to the contrary, there are two things we do know about this baptism.

1. There was water enough here for both Philip and the eunuch to go down into it together.

2. And they did both go down in it; for no honest scholar will deny that the record declares this fact. Elder Ditzler nor any other man could frame a Greek sentence that would more clearly express the fact that they *both* went down together *into* the water.

These two facts determined, and the meaning of *baptidzo* is self-evident; it must mean here "to immerse," and nothing else.

Mark the text of the record. The Holy Spirit declares that the Eunuch was *baptized*, and not the *water* baptized upon him. If *baptidzo* primarily means to *sprinkle* or to *pour*, then, when these verbs are not followed by an object that is divisible or separable into particles like water or sand, a preposition indicating "on," or "upon," must be used to indicate the act.

Remember that I have demonstrated that a person cannot be poured or sprinkled, *i. e.*, divided and scattered into particles—it is repugnant to human reason. We are convinced that no fair minded person can read this account of the Eunuch's baptism and not be forced to the conclusion that he was immersed in that certain water into which they both went down. A child of fourteen would form no other opinion. Here is what the most eminent Pedobaptist commentators are frank to say about it.

"Calvin, in his comment on this place, observes, 'Here we perceive how baptism was administered among the ancients, for they immersed the whole body in water.' *Pengilly*, p. 33.

"Doddridge, in his Family Expositor, says, '*They both went down*, etc. 'It would be very unnatural to suppose that they went down to the water merely that Philip might take up a little water *to pour* on the eunuch. A person of his dignity, no doubt, had many vessels in his baggage, on such a journey through a desert country, a precaution absolutely necessary for travelers in those parts, and never omitted by them. *1b. p. 33.*

"Every unprejudiced reader, whether he reads the the account of the

Eunuch's baptism in our common English versions, or in the original Greek, will say here is an unmistakable example of baptism, in minute detail, and that baptism was an immersion."—*Bailey (Bap.)* p. 273.

Lydia and the Jailor.

In the case of the baptism of Lydia and the jailor, at Philippi, we have none of the circumstances of baptism alluded to to indicate the *act*, but we *know* that there was plenty of water at the very spot, by the river side, where Paul preached and Lydia prayed, for the purpose of the immersion of Lydia and her household; and the same river was hard by the prison, if it did not wash its very walls; and we must be honest enough to believe, and candid enough to admit, that, if "immerse" is the primary meaning of the verb here employed to indicate the act of baptism, then these two converts with their households, were immersed. I mention the cases to show that there was no conceivable obstacle in the way of their immersion.

It has been urged that there was not water enough within the prison walls for sufficient immersion, when the best authorities tell us there always was in all Eastern prisons, as there is still, when all thinking people know that the jailor, being responsible for his prisoners, could take them wherever he saw fit. There are five hundred of the convicts of the penitentiary of Tennessee, from one to one hundred miles from their prison to-day, but in charge of their keepers.

"One Immersion."

The next reference to Christian baptism that I will briefly notice is to be found in Ephesians iv, 5, "One Lord, one faith, *one immersion.*"

The only thing in favor of the act in this passage is the word itself, which I translate *immersion* because it *cannot* be translated by either *sprinkling* or *pouring* and make sense, and, therefore, must *here*, even if the noun *baptisma* might *possibly* elsewhere mean effusion, be translated *immersion*. Every one, of course, knows that "baptism" is no translation of *baptisma*. Eld. Ditzler will not claim that it is; it is either *sprinkling*,

pouring or immersion. That it is water baptism alluded to here, we think no candid mind will doubt, and not spiritual baptism, as some controversialists affirm. The operations of the Spirit are embraced in the allusion to the one Spirit in the fourth verse. Christian baptism follows the one faith, and the one Lord, and the one body, because it is the act in and by which we profess the one faith in the one Lord, and are by it introduced into the one body, which is the church of God. This statement is most unquestionably true to-day.

But if the baptism of the Spirit is alluded to, then there are certainly two baptisms in force, that of the Spirit and that of water, which is not the case; and since we know that water baptism was instituted to be observed in the churches of Christ to the end of the ages, we would know, if the Holy Spirit had not told us, that Spirit baptism had passed away with the other gifts. But we may easily ascertain the meaning of this noun by determining the *subject* of the baptism. Is it *water*, then it must mean sprinkling or pouring, but if it is a person or persons, then it must mean immersion, because persons cannot be the subject of *baptidzo* without a preposition being expressed or understood.

But finally, if all Greek lexicons give immersion as the primary meaning of the Greek term *baptisma*, then it must mean one immersion in this passage, and nothing else. But every Greek lexicon, known to me, does give immersion as the definition of *baptisma*; therefore an immersion is its true definition.

Mark if Eld. Ditzler presents a lexicon that gives sprinkling or pouring as the primary meaning of *baptisma*. If he does not, he gives up this passage by his very silence, and I have proved that the whole question before us is demonstratively settled by this one passage. **THERE IS ONE IMMERSION.**

"Buried in Baptism." Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 29.

In these three passages the apostle evidently sets forth the design or symbolism of Christian baptism. Had not the tradition of the elder's affusion been foisted into the practice of professed churches there never would have been a doubt

raised touching the symbolism of the ordinance, as set forth in these passages. Among the Christian fathers, as among the most eminent and standard Pedobaptist commentators of every age, there is no disagreement as to the symbolic teaching of the rite—i. e. that the believer sets forth the death, burial and resurrection of Christ, and of his own conformity to, and participation in, the same events, by a burial of the whole body in water, as Christ was buried in the Jordan to prefigure his own death and burial, and rising and coming up out of the water, as he did, to represent his future resurrection, which symbolism is a graphic epitome of the whole gospel of Christ, as he declared it to be the figurative “fulfilling of all righteousness.”

Paul thus sets forth these three acts :

“Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand ; by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures ; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures.”—[1 Cor. iv, 1-4.

That Paul intended to teach that, in their baptism, the Corinthians set forth these facts, and pre-eminently the resurrection of Christ for our justification. In the twenty-ninth verse of the same chapter he refers to the profession which they had made in their baptism, in proof that there is to be a future resurrection of the dead. It appears that there were some who declared that the resurrection was already past, or that there would be no resurrection of the dead. (Verse 12). Paul’s argument is, that if this was so, they made a false profession in the very act of their baptism, and consequently the entire system of Christianity which they embraced was false. “Else what shall they do which are baptized for the [resurrection of the] dead, if the dead rise not at all ? Why are they then baptized for the [resurrection of] the dead ? And why stand we in jeopardy every hour ?” In other words, why did you represent the resurrection of the dead in your baptism, if indeed there is to be no resurrection ? Why did you, then, in your baptism, declare your faith in a resurrec-

tion? If this be the signification of the ordinance, then it must be clear to all that the act of immersion alone can represent it; sprinkling and pouring are out of the question. In no conceivable way does the sprinkling of a few drops of water upon a person represent a *burial*, which is the only likeness of death in the universe, or the resurrection of Christ from the grave.

The only question Eld. Ditzler can raise here, is whether these expressions refer to water baptism. He like a few other controversialists, will deny that they do, because if once admitted the act is determined to have been immersion, and nothing else, beyond all controversy.

That they do refer to water baptism there is, with but few exceptions, the utmost accord among the scholars of all denominations. If any one taught otherwise until within the present century, I have not learned it.

As I have, in a former speech, quoted some thirty of these, and as I shall have occasion to quote many of them again on another proposition, I will show here that it is the doctrine of Elder Ditzler's church, which he stands here to represent, and if he opposes its doctrines, why, then, he and his bishops for it.

Bishop McTycire, in his recent *Manual*, tells us that Wesley's Works, Adam Clarke, R. Watson, the Discipline, and the standard authors published by the Book Concern are the reliable exponents of the faith of Methodists, and not any particular traveling preacher. Now, let us see what these teach concerning these passages.

Wesley, the father and founder of Methodism, says in his notes:

“Buried with him,” alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion.”—Rom. vi. 4.

Will Elder Ditzler put up his opinion against Wesley?

“DR. A. CLARKE.—“They received baptism as an emblem of death, in voluntarily going under the water, so they receive it as an emblem of resurrection unto eternal life, in coming up out of the water. (Com. on 1 Cor. xv. 29.) “It is probable that the apostle here alludes to the mode of administering baptism by immersion, the whole body being put under the water.—Rom. vi. 6.

WHITFIELD.—‘It is certain that in the words of our text (Rom. vi. 3, 4) there is an allusion to the manner of baptism, which was by immersion.’

Benson and Burkitt are commentators whose works are published by the Methodist book Concern.

Benson says :

“We are buried with him,” alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion.”—Roman vi. 4

Burkitt says :

“‘We are buried with him by baptism into death.’ The apostle alludes, no doubt, to the ancient way and manner of baptizing persons in those hot countries, which was by immersion, or putting them under water for a time, and then raising them up again out of the water.”—Expo. on Rom. vi. 4.

“DR. S. CLAKE.—‘Rom. viii. 11. And this was most significantly represented by their descending into the water, and rising out of it again. For as Christ descended into the earth, and was raised again from the dead by the glory of the Father, so persons baptized were buried with him by baptism into death (Rom. vi. 4), and rose again after the similitude of his resurrection.’ Three Essays, p. 12.”

Whatever Elder Ditzler may think or say, in this we have the faith of all orthodox Methodists endorsed by the General Conference. This is enough for my purpose, and I submit my argument from these passages.

1. If they refer to water baptism, as all standard commentators of all ages teach that they do, then, immersion of believers in water must have been *the* act, and the *only* act known to the apostles and the New Testament church.

2. But these passages do most obviously refer to water baptism, for to refer them to the baptism of the Spirit is incongruous and contradictory; for, by that baptism no one was ever baptized *into Christ* or *into his death* or *into the likeness of his death*, nor did Christ himself ever receive that baptism; nor has any living Christian.

3. Therefore immersion was *the* act which the apostles understood Christ to command when he gave the commission.

Against all this, and the voice of his own church and of its great scholars, Elder D. may oppose his *opinions* and his *assertions* but he can do nothing more. His brethren must choose between him and their church.

"Our bodies washed in pure water."

I have no doubt that this passage refers to Christian baptism, for the apostle evidently teaches us that the acts are the antitypes of the typical purification for uncleanness, as enjoined in Numbers xix, 17 to 19:

"And for an unclean person they shall take of the ashes of the burnt heifer of purification for sin, and running water shall be put thereto in a vessel; and a clean person shall take hyssop, and dip it in the water, and sprinkle it upon the tent, and upon all the vessels, and upon the persons that were there, and upon him that touched a bone, or one slain, or one dead, or a grave; and the clean person shall sprinkle upon the unclean on the third day, and on the seventh day; and on the seventh day he shall purify himself, and wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water, and shall be clean at even."

This water of purification represented the cleansing efficacy of the blood of Christ, and the sprinkling of it upon defiled persons represented the sprinkling of the blood of Christ upon the conscience, cleansing it from all sin, and the bathing of the person in water, which involved an immersion, was typical of the immersion of the cleansed convert!—indicative of the fact that we should be inwardly and outwardly pure, that not only should we be pure in heart, but obedient in our lives; our souls and our bodies being thus consecrated to the service of God.

With this view of the passage, how appropriate the language of Paul? Baptism becomes a profession of our faith, and fitness for the body of Christ—bathing the entire body, in the type, was a declaration of the subject's purification from sin, and fitness for the congregation of Israel and the service of his God.

I say of this passage as Conybeare and Howson say of Romans vi, 4: "This passage cannot be understood unless it be borne in mind that the primitive baptism was by immersion." I shall have use for this passage in another proposition, to show that in every case the cleansing work of the Spirit precedes baptism.

Thus have I shown, that in every instance where the apostles refer to Christian baptism, in all their writings, they

clearly teach that immersion only was the one act which the Savior enjoined, when he commanded them to baptize; and infallibly guided as they were by the Holy Spirit, they could not have erred. IMMERSION MUST HAVE BEEN THE ACT.

Here I close the examination of the New Testament, having demonstrated that John, Christ and the evangelists and inspired apostles, one and all, used *baptidzo* and *baptisma* in the sense of "immerse" and "immersion" and in no other. That the act, when spoken of by Paul, is called a "burying," a "planting," and a bathing or washing of the body in water. (Rom. 6, 4. Heb. x, 22.)

I have also shown that the symbolism of Christian baptism demands the immersion of the whole body, and that the sprinkling or pouring of a few drops of water upon the head will, in no sense, satisfy the figure of the passage, and is therefore out of the question.

I have shown that in every passage in which *baptidzo* and *baptisma* occur, immerse and immersion alone will make sense, and therefore are the only proper meanings of these terms. I am willing to submit my Bible argument to the verdict of all unprejudiced men. The question now to be considered, is: Do classic authors, do the Lexicons and Ancient Versions; do historians and standard scholars, though Pedobaptists, support the New Testament meaning of *baptidzo* *i. e.*, that primarily and literally it means to immerse? In the examination of these, I shall reply to all relevant arguments my opponent may have put forward, drawn from these sources.

Replication.

1. He affirms that he endorses Blackstone, in everything, and yet he really does in nothing expressed under our rule. Blackstone says that in interpreting law, "words must be used in their most usual and most known signification." Elder D. invariably selects the secondary—figurative and remote meanings! Now he says that the current meaning of a word is not its meaning, and that the definitions placed first in the lexicons, are not the primary! It seems useless to refute a state-

ment that every scholar and intelligent reader knows to be false. I will only quote the Rules of Interpretation agreed upon by us at the outstart:

I. *Every word must have some specific idea or notion which we call meaning.* Were not this so, words would be meaningless and useless.

II. The *literal*, which is also called the *grammatical sense of a word*, is the sense so connected with it that it is first in order, and is spontaneously presented to the mind as soon as the sound is heard. This meaning is always (save in one lexicon, *i. e.*, *Stokius'*) placed first in the lexicons, and is known as the *primary meaning*.

III. "The primary or literal meaning is *the only true one*."—*Ernesti*, p. 14.

Ernesti quotes Morus in support of this:

"There can be no certainty at all in respect to the interpretation of any passage, unless a kind of necessity compels us to affix a particular sense to a word; which sense, as I have before said, must be *one*; and unless there are special reasons for a *tropical* (or secondary) meaning, it must be the literal sense."

The primary or literal meaning, is the only *true* one, and this in all lexicons (save one, *Stokius'*, and he informs us of the change,) is placed first in the lexicons, and this is the one I have invariably used, while my opponent has used figurative ones throughout!

This is another settled point, and I shall discuss it no more. He will succeed in making himself the laughing stock of every schoolboy by his historical primary.

He says he endorses Blackstone, and yet misinterprets him to mean what he does not say. Blackstone does not say that "the literature to be examined must be kindred," etc. Not one word like it; but here are his very words:

"If words happen still to be dubious, we may establish their meaning from the context, etc. Of the same nature and use is the comparison of law with laws that are made by the same legislator, that *have some affinity with the subject*, or that EXPRESSLY RELATE TO THE SAME POINT." [See my fourth speech.]

The Elder asks, "What affinity classic Greek has with New Testament Greek?"

We will see what affinity Classic Greek has with Bible Greek, when I reach the lexicons, and I will show you that unless it is the same Greek, the New Testament is not a revelation to man. Remember that Elder Ditzler denies that it has any relation.

2. But what did we hear fall from his lips? Why, that Christ and the inspired writers of the New Testament did not understand Greek! That the Divine Son of God did not know the meaning of the verb *baptidzo*, which he used when he commanded John and his own disciples to baptize—when he gave the commission, “the one law of baptism.” Think of it; Christ charged with giving a law in terms which he did not himself understand! I have no such charge against my Law-Giver. If the Greeks, in any age, had used *baptidzo*, Christ knew what they meant by the term, and I here assert what I shall prove when I reach the classic writers of Greece, that what *baptidzo* meant to the Greeks two hundred years before Christ, that it meant when Christ spoke the language and the evangelists and the apostles wrote it, and that it meant in A. D. 1100, and that it means this day. I will show when I reach the lexicons, what every one before me knows, who is accountable, that “to make drunk,” no more than to wash, is the meaning of *baptidzo*—no more than to look into a book is a definition of our verb to dip. Yet we say of a book, that we have just dipped into it, here and there; but what would this community think of me, and what would the scholars present say, should I seriously claim that to read a little while here and there is the real meaning of to dip?

All must have observed, that up to this time, my arguments from the Bible have met with very little opposition, indeed, so little, I feel safe in saying that they are impliedly conceded. If he could have demolished them, he would have done so, but he has scarce made an attempt.

He has brought forward the phrase *diaphorais baptismois*, “divers washings.” Hebrew x, 9, and insists that they refer to the sprinklings, and pourings, and partial washings enjoined under the Mosaic law for purification. My position is, that the reference is to the immersions enjoined for various pollutions that could not be cleansed except by immersing or bathing the whole body in water. His whole disquisition touching the brazen laver, and the innumerable baptisms by sprinkling, (we can as well say sprinklings by immersion) are waste words. I certainly never, in my review of Stuart or elsewhere, mentioned that they were divers sorts of immer-

sions, but immersions for divers purposes. Two quotations will abundantly suffice to support my view.

"DR. J. ALTING.—'Washings the apostle calls *diaphorous baptismous* divers baptisms—that is, *various immersions*, for *baptismos* is *immersion*, since the whole body immersed; but the term is NEVER used concerning *asper*-sion. The Seventy use *bapto* or *baptidzo* for *tabal*, *he dipped*, *he dipped into*, *he immersed*; whence *baptismos*, with the Hebrews, is called *tabelah*. The word *hazzah*, *he sprinkled*, they never translate *baptidzo*, because it signifies more than is expressed by that Hebrew term; but instead of it they use *rhaino*, *perirraino*, *prosraino*, *rhantizo*, *perrirantizo*, *to sprinkle*. The verb *rahhatz*, *he washed*, is frequently used, either alone or with the addition of the word *flesh*, and the whole flesh, which is baptism. It is often used in connection with the washing of the clothes; whence the Jews observe that, whenever a command occurs for washing the clothes, the washing the whole body is either added or understood. Further, those Jewish baptisms were manifold; as of the high priest [Lev. xvi. 4]; of the priests, at their consecration [Ex. xxix. 4; Lev. viii. 6]; and of the Levites, when about to be appointed to their office (Num. viii. 7, 21); of all Israel, when the covenant was to be promulgated (Ex. xix. 10, 14); especially of those that were defiled by the carcass of an unclean animal (Lev. xi.); by the leprosy (Lev. xiv.);' etc. Opera, tom. iv., Com. in Epis. ad Heb., p. 260."

"DR. KITTO.—'The Mosaic law recognizes eleven species of uncleanness from positive defilement, the purification from which ceased at the end of a certain period, provided the unclean person then *washed his body and his clothes*; but in a few cases, such as leprosy, and the defilement contracted by touching a dead body, he remained unclean seven days after the physical cause of pollution had ceased. This kind of ablution for substantial uncleanness answers to the Moslem—*ghash*.' (In this the body is wholly immersed: not a single hair must be omitted.)"

These witnesses are supported by all Jewish scholars and expositors. We see then, and know, that they did immerse themselves after coming from market; and we can understand what the apostles meant by divers immersions; therefore *baptisma* signifies in translation and this place immersion. His translation of Maimonides is strikingly characteristic. Translating Hebrew, no more than Greek, is his *forte*—he is so peculiarly unfortunate. Now I must so far anticipate my arguments from Ancient Versions, as to say here, what no scholar will deny, that the verb *taval* and noun *tabelah*, in Hebrew, mean, literally and primarily, to immerse and immersion, and never anything else, except figuratively. With these facts in your mind, notice how he translated Maimonides. I will repeat it:

"Wherever in the law washing occurs, either of the body, (*bashar* *flesh*)

or of the garments, from defilement, (*min*), nothing else is to be understood than the washing (*tabelah*) [*tabelah* means immersion, and not *washing*—never, except by metonymy], of the whole body at a fountain, [or in concepticle of water]. And that which is said, [here extra defilement is described], ‘and he shall not wash (*shataph*) his hands with water,” is to be understood as if he said he must wash (*shitabul*, *tabal*) his whole body with water. And after the same order shall other impurities be judged of; so that if one *should wash* himself all over (*tabal kulo*).

It is by the sort of translation indicated above that he seeks to make out his case. I will translate it literally. “Wherever in the law washings occur, either of the flesh or the garment from defilement, nothing else is to be understood than the —*tabelah*—immersion of the whole body in a bath. And that which is said “he shall not wash his hands in water,” is to be understood as if he said he must—*tabal*—immerse his whole body in water. And after the same order shall other impurities be judged of, so that if one should—*tabal*—immerse himself all over except the extremity of his little finger, he is yet in his uncleanness.

Take this with what Dr. Alting says of the verb *rachats*, to wash, when used in connection with the body or *flesh* or the clothes, that it always implies an immersion. My opponent talks about “crushing facts” in his last speech. I think these I have now submitted are of this character, but I am willing to admit that his translation was a crushing one—to a scholarly reputation.

If he will give the text of the whole sentence in which his claimed baptism, *epi koitæ*, occurs, I will examine it and prove to you that Clemens Alexandrianus never did say that Jew or Gentile was *baptized* upon a couch. I want him to do it, and then we will have another trial of his translating.

You will please notice that he disclaims translating *tingo*, the Latin word, that all the ancient lexicons give as a definition of baptidzo, by sprinkle. See if he does not in the end fully rely altogether upon it to make out his case.

What were the mighty array of crushing facts he brought forward from his Greek lexicons—what were they? Did you hear him read “*to sprinkle* or *to pour*,” as the primary meaning of one of them? If he did, then he interpolated it into his author? I challenge him to produce one standard lexicon of

the Greek language that gives "to sprinkle," as a primary meaning. I call this a crushing fact; but to whom? To whose cause?

Let me tell you, and he will not presume to deny it, that not one of those authors he mentioned, gives *adspergo*, *conspergo*, *aspersio*, *per* or *profundo* as the proper, primary, or literal signification of *baptidzo*. They are not one of them the proper meaning of *baptidzo*.

Eld. Ditzler repeatedly affirms that, if Paul refers to water baptism, Rom. vi, 4, then he insists that Paul was under water when he was writing and all the brethren at Rome were still under water, because the English version has it, "are buried." What a criticism for a scholar! Notwithstanding I have shown him that the text is in the *aorist tense*, which points to a past transaction, as every scholar knows, yet he calls upon me to produce modern scholarship in support of my position. I will here introduce Conybeare and Howson; they are scholars, and standards, and their book is one of the text books prescribed by the Conference for young ministers to study. They translate this passage thus:

"What shall we say then? Shall we persist in sin that the gift of grace may be more abundant? God forbid. We, who have died to sin, how can we any longer live in sin; or have you forgotten that all of us, when we were baptized into fellowship with Christ Jesus, were baptized into fellowship with his death? with him, therefore, we *were* buried by the baptism wherein we shared his death," etc., and in a marginal note they add: "THIS PASSAGE CANNOT BE UNDERSTOOD UNLESS IT BE BORNE IN MIND THAT THE PRIMITIVE BAPTISM WAS BY IMMERSION."

I now call attention to the law of evidence. My witnesses are all disinterested men, in fact, they are denominationally identified with my opponent; that is, they are Pedobaptists, and cannot, therefore, be prejudiced in my favor at all, and yet notice how fully, in every position I have taken, they sustain me. Against all these, and the obvious meaning of the word of God, you have Elder Ditzler's unsupported assertion!

In my next speech, I shall show what *baptidzo* means in classic Greek, before, in the days of, and subsequent to the apostolic age, and will examine some of Elder Ditzler's strange assertions.—[*Time out.*]

DR. DITZLER'S NINTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—Dr. Graves says some strange things. He says the sacred teachers never command where it is *elliptical*. It is a wonder he does not recollect that the commission itself is elliptical—very much so. *Baptize*—whom? *the nations* as such? O, no, says he—it is *elliptical* language—it means those *believing*, he will tell you.

But he throws himself on that canon that A. Campbell relied on—surrendered by our opponents in Kentucky, that the verb must terminate upon the *individual*, as *baptidzo* does, and *sprinkle* cannot do so. Hence *baptidzo* cannot mean to sprinkle, as sprinkle implies to scatter in drops or disperse as dust, ashes, water. I am astonished that a man of Dr. Graves' capacity should hold to such an opinion. We have noticed it before, but let us expose fully this thin and innocent conceit of immersionists.

1. There are verbs that take *two* accusatives. That ought to show him his error.

2. We do not hold that *baptidzo* means to sprinkle only, and nothing else; for we have shown the contrary abundantly. It belongs to that large class of verbs that primarily meant to *sprinkle*, yet mean to moisten, wet, pour, drench, intoxicate, wash, overflow, etc.—sink. Now *balal* in Hebrew, all authorities agree, means primarily to *sprinkle*, yet comes to mean to *dip*. It takes the accusative—terminates on the object *always*. *Chamats* to sprinkle, *mathath*, sprinkle, take direct objects, terminate on the object sprinkled with water, just as *raino* in Greek does. Let us take now a few of the sixteen or eighteen Greek words that mean to sprinkle at times. We select *raino*, or *rantidzo*, they *constantly* take the direct object—terminate upon the object—sprinkle a man, book, house, rock, floor—just as our English word sprinkle. So does *passo* (*patto*) *brecho*, *deuo*, *kludzo*, *pallasso*, *aionao*, *koniao*; All these termi-

nate upon the man, the object, and mean to sprinkle, some of them meaning that, almost all the time. This destroys his theory. Surely *they* never scatter the objects they terminate upon, in drops or in dust.

3. A number of them mean to moisten also, to stain, color. To color or stain does not mean to scatter in drops. The Hebrew, Arabic, etc., have many, many words that mean to sprinkle, moisten, color, dip, immerse—same word meaning all those things. Now we gave a perfect catalogue of words with such meanings. This I must say ridiculous *canon* (?) of theirs, contradicts all these facts, denies the definitions of *every and all lexicons of all the languages of Europe and Asia Minor*. It charges Paul, Solomon, David, Isaiah, all with ignorance. Then

4. I presumed the fact that as words meaning to *moisten, color, stain*, necessarily terminate upon the object stained, defiled, soiled, wet, moistened, yet did it by sprinkling the object with the coloring, soiling, defiling matter or liquid, *that* would make it clear to his mind. But it did not.

5. As Origen and Basil say *baptize* the wood, baptize the altar where it was pouring—so declared by the Bible—1 Kings xviii, 33, David baptized his couch, the woman baptized the feet of Christ with her tears, they baptized—Syriac sprinkled the coat of Joseph with blood of a kid—these facts should settle it alone also. We assert—it is correct Grammar—there is *no* ellipsis in the form, when we say sprinkle a man. It is correct in Latin, Greek, German, Arabic, Hebrew, Syriac, Chaldee or Italian. Our *English* sprinkle is meant to meet *all* words meaning to sprinkle, and as *some* mean to disperse, scatter in drops—our word sometimes implies it, but in seven cases, if not *nine*, out of every ten, it is not the case. I need not revert to this more.

That you may see how absurd is the rendering of *baptidzo* by *immerse*—that you may see that it is not immerse—that immerse is never an equivalent of *baptidzo* in the N. T., let me put it into English. The English of immerse is *sink in, sink*. How will it read now from the position of Dr. Graves in his last speech to carry it out, and say, in those days came John

the *sinker*. It is rendered *soak* by several Baptists. In those days came John the *soaker*. Sophocles, whom Dr. Graves eulogized so much, renders *baptidzo* "soaked in liquor," "drown," "sink," "intoxicate." "Go ye disciple all nations *drowning* them, &c." "Ye shall be *soaked* in fire." The Doctor falls back on that old crotchet, as weak as the "scatter-in-drops" hobby, that if *baptidzo* means to pour, to sprinkle, and to immerse, not till all three of these are effected is he baptized!! Does the Doctor *really, candidly* believe in such—well, must I say *logic* or *trash* as that? Take now classic use, *baptidzo* is applied to intoxicating, burdening with debts, calamities, confusing with questions, aspersing, pouring torrents of abuse upon people. Does he not know that *if any one* of these happened to one, he was baptized? If Plato got *drunk* he was classically baptized. If Clinias was overwhelmed with *questions*, he was baptized. If a city was overwhelmed with calamities, *it* was baptized. If a land was overflowed it was baptized. If a ship went to the bottom *it* was baptized. If a man had a torrent of abuse poured upon him *he* was baptized. In *none* of these senses is it used in the New Testament. It indicates the purifying spirit there. As in the one case if any *one* of these processes takes place the object is baptized in its classic sense, so if he be sprinkled or perfused or immersed and emerged, he is baptized. In no case did it require all its classic meaning to be carried out, to constitute classic literature, but only *one*, so here of course. It is hard to understand why immersionists are so stolid here, when they know all these facts hold good in *every word on earth*. Take *go*. If I ride on horse, in buggy, car, stage, walk, travel in boat or balloon, I *go*. Do I have to do all to *go*? Purify. Houses were purified one way, some people one way, some another. For some ceremonial defilements, some men were purified one way, some another. A great many ways were they purified. But whatever the *mode*, it was *all a purification*. So here, it is baptism, whether by sprinkling, pouring or dipping, though it does not even mean to dip.

He proposes to substitute *sprinkle* wherever *baptidzo* occurs to test whether you can baptize by sprinkling. Does not

baptidzo apply to *being drunk*, to *sinking ships*, to pouring abuse on people, to overflowing, &c., &c.? Now substitute one of these terms—each of them *wherever baptidzo* occurs, and what will you have? *Balal* in Arabic is to sprinkle most commonly, yet we saw it translated *bapto* where one is to dip his finger in water, another dip his hand in the dish—will it do to say *sprinkle* in *those* cases? Now why not throw away all this child's play criticism and come out and confront the great facts involved in this question by which alone both causes are to be tried—tested? You purify, cleanse houses, people, vessels, ceremonially in the law almost always by sprinkling. Suppose you substitute sprinkle for cleanse, purify—will it do? Now the truth is, while *baptidzo* means *primarily* to sprinkle, moisten, wet, then pour, wash, it has by Conant 14, by A. Campbell 20 meanings—but as a New Testament word for one of the ordinances of the church *no one word can represent it*. *Sink* will not—i. e. immerse. *Sinking* is not baptizing in a Christian sense. I put a man clear under water—is he immersed? *Yes*. Is he *baptized*? *No*. He is not *out yet*—must *rise*. Well he *is immersed* now, *that* is settled? *Yes*. He *is not yet baptized*? *No*. Then I lift him up—he stands out of the water. Is he *now immersed*? *No*. Is he *baptized*? You say *yes*. Then you see *immersion* is not baptism—*cannot* translate the word. It is a perversion that requires a terrible aberration of mind to sanction to call immersion—mere *immersion* baptism, where *no* Baptist on earth would accept it without the *emersion* also. There is that in baptism in the New Testament sense, which *no one word can represent*—neither sprinkle, pour, immerse, i. e., *sink*—no, nor purify even. Hence in *all* languages that have affinity with the Greek in early versions it was *transferred* in the New Testament altogether. The two Latin, the Sahidic and Basmuric, 2nd and 3rd centuries, all transfer the word. Hence all our six English versions and all Latin ones, wherever the *ordinance* is referred to, transfer it. It is rendered *wash*, in other cases save by the Vulgate. So the Spanish, Italian, French, &c., do. The others translate by *generic* words that had *no trace of modality left*, such as the German *ich taufe euch mit wasser*—using that term when they dipped, when they *sprinkled* them, when they poured water upon

them. Hence it was used by them as we do *baptize*—the word of an ordinance *with no regard to its mode*. These are facts he dare not gainsay.

He says *baptidzo* was used as *tingo* is, if I caught his words. It is certain Cyprian, Tertullian and the Latin fathers used *tingo* most constantly to represent baptism in their writings in the 2nd and 3rd centuries. But *that* is anything else than *immerse*. *Tingo* means to moisten, to wet, and those are the renderings *first* given by every standard Latin lexicon in Europe or America—Freund, Andrews, Schiller, Leverett, Bullion, White, Anthon—all of them, and all the large ones, give it as the *equivalent* of the Greek *tengo*, *brecho*, *hugraino*—all being Greek words of *affusion*, as he will not deny. Most of them do not give dip as a remote, derived meaning of *tingo*, while Ainsworth gives to sprinkle. It is often used where it is by sprinkling. The word, all agree, is from the Greek *tengo* as Carson says, and means in Greek to moisten. It is most applied to the effect of falling tears, sometimes to dew, &c. Now is it not assuming much to translate this word *tingo*, in view of these facts, immerse, or dip, as necessarily implying total putting under the element? It only implies dip at all *derivatively*, then often a very partial dip. Furst uses it for the German *benetzen*—moisten. Schindler uses it for *brecho*, applied to tears, rain, &c. But I care not for *tingo* as I built nothing on it at all. I translate it moisten or wet, and giving its *remote* meanings in my debate with Dr. Wilkes, I put *dip* and *sprinkle*, both, for so it is rendered by lexicons, and by the *best standards* put equivalent to Greek words meaning to sprinkle, shed forth, &c. Such is the word by the Latin fathers for baptize.

Again Dr. Graves comes upon *tzeva*, baptize. Let me quote DR. J. R. GRAVES, he copying Judd the Baptist so zealous for immersion, Appendix to M. Stuart, p. 247; “But *amad*, is not the only word used in the Syriac to translate baptizo. The very word (*tzeva*) which Professor Stuart mentions as properly signifying IMMERSION, is often used to designate the ordinance of baptism. Professor Stuart with Michaelis in his hands, cannot be ignorant of this.” All that is true—it is so used. In the Ar-

abic it translates *baptidzo* in the New Testament over thirty times, and is used in Acts viii. 38, where the Eunuch was baptized. Now what will the Doctor say to this? In the golden age of Arabic learning, when they translated Homer, Aristotle and Plato, and studied them well; when they had linguists that used forty-seven dialects and invented Algebra; when they had libraries of hundreds of thousands of volumes—in their golden age of culture *they* translated *baptidzo* by this word. Yet Furst defines *tzeva* thus: “to moisten, to besprinkle, to baptize, Pual, to water, to moisten.” Castell gives “*pour out*,” (*effudit*) and Jerome the learned Hebrew and Syriac scholar of the 4th century, translates it once *conspergatur*—*sprinkle*, once *infunderis besprinkled* Who is wild, crazy?

Now this word that Stuart surrendered to the immersionists most inconsistently—for its Greek rendering in Dan. iv and v, Stuart uses ably for *his* side—was so little examined that S. thought it was *immerse*, whereas the only places in which it occurs in the whole Old Testament are the very cases where from the *Greek*, Stuart supports *sprinkling*. It is inconsistent to quote the Greek of a passage to prove it occurs *there* in the sense of *sprinkle*, yet admit and *state* that the original *Chaldee* of which the Greek is a mere version, supports *immersion*. It is the case of the King’s “body *wet with dew from Heaven*.” So the original reads.

Now, then, to show further that *tzeva*, which translates *baptidzo* in Syriac and Arabic as well as *bapto*, applies to affusion, it occurs of blood gushing from a wound, to *juice* dropping or trickling from trees cut, from vines—so used in *Al Koran* also. This word was regarded by the immersionists as so firmly fixed as *their’s* that *it* was used by them as *unquestioned* property. No marvel if they hate to surrender it, especially does it hurt. These facts show several things.

1. That this question has been treated even by such men as Stuart with entire empiricism—neglect of study and pains.

2. That immersionists jump at conclusions with no foundation to rest upon.

3. That this whole question badly needed a careful, scientific treatment.

Now, then, we have all points clearly before you. Dr. Graves makes the sprinkle of *brecho* very little—it was a *light* sprinkle—not *baptidzo*, but *brecho*, applied to *very slight* sprinklings. *Exactly* so. We accede to *all* that. But the point is—*when the Syrians and Arabians translate that delicate sprinkle by their leading word for baptize, what becomes of your immerse?* Does that word that translates *so delicate a sprinkle* mean and imply *immersion*? It shows that when they used it for translating *baptidzo*, they did not regard *baptidzo* as meaning immerse in the Bible *anywhere at all*.

As to “bury,” until the Doctor answers the facts we adduce, we need pay no attention to it farther. We showed that it did not necessarily imply covering up, as Jer. xxii, 19 shows where *twice* it applies to a man left on the ground to decay, “*buried with the burial of an ass.*” The dark age writers clung to it as a great text. We do not rely on *them*, but the Bible.

The Doctor now goes back on the *Peshito*. He wishes to date it later now than he did when he thought it favored immersion. When he endorsed Judd, who says: “It was made *at least as early as the beginning of the second century.*” Ap. to Stuart, p. 215, it was *all right*. John lived till then. He thinks it was likely made *earlier* than *then*, as *all* of the *eminent* Syriac scholars, who are the only competent critics here, held. So held that great fountain of criticism, Walton, Carpzov, Leusden, Davidson, Lowth, Kennicott, Tremelius and Stiles, President of Yale College. Dr. Gale regarded it as quite as authoritative as the autographs of the apostles. We read his words once to you. Origen, born A. D. 185, quotes its title, A. D. 215, as a familiar work. It shows that our opponents value anything only if it favors their notions, dates, values, all are thus to be estimated—they turn back upon their own records fearlessly, if they find their cause suffering.

Dr. Graves tells us now that all the lexicons give immerse as *the primary* meaning. Not a word of it. He asserts that the first definition set down by a lexicographer is *the primary* meaning of a word. That is utterly gratuitous; not the case. Let us see, however, if the lexicons are as uniform as he

makes them to be. We think not. We will begin with his favorite—Liddell and Scott—“*baptidzo, to dip repeatedly.*” Is that its *primary* meaning? Do you *dip repeatedly* when you baptize? But you can dip an object, and “*repeatedly,*” and not put a *fourth part under* the element. It is *very* indefinite. But you say a definition is of *no value unless* supported by *texts* in the languages the lexicons are defining. That is true—every word of it. But where do you, or this lexicographer, to whose work you anchor, find a place where *baptidzo* means *to dip repeatedly*? *Nowhere on earth—nowhere!* Then, “of ships, *to dip* them.” Will that do? He gives “it to *draw water*”—where has it that meaning? Nowhere. Sophocles, his next favorite gives—“to dip” first. Is that its primary meaning? Why, we saw that Ingham, whose work the Doctor uses here and I have it too—the great Baptist of London, on this question, out of one hundred sixty-nine cases, renders it *dip* only *once*. Conant, out of sixty-three consecutive cases, in which it is *whelm* forty-five times, “overwhelm” eight times, renders it *dip*, not *once*. A. Campbell never gives to dip. Leigh tells us “primarily it signifies *any kind of washing*, or immersion, etc.” One gives overwhelm (*obruo*) first—another, “I cover with water”—first—that is your crazy man Ewing. It is a good proof he was crazy, I admit. Scapula, Stephanus, etc., all give *sink* [*mergo*] as their first rendering. Parkhurst dip—Robinson “to dip in,” occurs as the first classic meaning. Here, then, his lexicons give us this *medley*—“dip repeatedly” as the primary meaning—assuming now with Dr. Graves, that they are treating of its primary meaning. No, no, cries every Baptist, if that be its meaning, I’m not baptized—I was not dipped repeatedly—only *once*. Call in another—Hedericus. Scapula, Stephanus—“sink.” Horrors! that won’t do—give us a better primary than that. Robinson, etc.—“dip in”—an’t you going to dip us *out* again, also? That won’t do, I dip my finger *in* that drop of water on the board; dip my pen in ink; no covering, burying; no envelopment here; all is in doubt; we want more certainty than that. Others; 1st. Edition of Wahl, Leigh, etc., *wash*; others, overwhelm; not one yet suits for a primary. Ah, Ewing has it—“cover with water;” but, he is crazy! Alas! for primary from lexicons!

You see all the lexicons utterly fail to support immerse as a primary meaning. If they had done so they would have been false, for it is *not* a primary as we *demonstrated* from its *earliest* use—it *never* being used for immerse till in Polybius—in the decay of the Greek language. We demonstrated it from the greatest immersion sources—when Conant out of sixty-three consecutive occurrences—p. 43 to 84—renders it immerse *only ten* times, overwhelm fifty-three times. If then, its most devoted friends can do no more than *this*, and show fifty-three occasions where it is *affusion*—the element coming *on the object* as waves leaping upon ships—dashed against them by the wind and throwing showers upon them—when *they* make *such* a showing for the *prevailing* and *current* meaning, what becomes of *primary* even in Dr. Graves' sense of primary? Hence, Passow tells us of *baptidzo* "GENERALLY, to besprinkle (*uber-giessen*) to pour upon, to overwhelm,"—(*uberschutten*, etc.) Alas for immerse as a *primary*! Hence, if Dr. Graves is correct in *either* position, then not a Baptist here is Scripturally baptized, save those who went from us.

As to the authorities, he may quote fifty to favor his views, and seven-tenths of them sustain ours, while we can quote twice as many more that destroy his position, aside from the record of lexicons and versions. All the array of authors often quoted—Witsius, Tarretinus, Buxtorff, Vossius, Wall, Koenel, Tholuck, Olshausen, Ebrard, Havernick, Rossenmuller, Lightfoot, Clarke, Beza, Stier, Hengstenberg, Baumgarten—all support us—their name is *legion*.

As to Blackstone—we say that the true intent and meaning of him is, that first you study the meaning of the word in the given authority, and if it cannot thus be determined, next after looking into any other book on *the same* or *kindred* subject, look into *contemporary* writers on same subject or kindred, and *that* is legitimate aid. Any way, whether B. said so or not, *that* is the right way—deny it if you dare. Are *you* not even running clear off into dark age literature—into lexicons never designed to explain New Testament Greek at all, to determine New Testament usage? Have not Baptists ransacked Homer, Plutarch, Diodorus Siculus, Strabo and Tatius

to settle a Bible usage, hardly pausing to notice the Bible itself? Now when we fail to agree on what the Greek text means, what should be *the next best help—the best aid?* Certainly, *all the world of scholars and all immersionists always* held since they heard of *Syriac*, that *oldest, purest, most literal, most faithful* version—"made," says Judd, "by men *who spoke both languages—men most competent—by those who understood and spoke BOTH languages PRECISELY as the sacred writers [the apostles] themselves understood and spoke them.*" So says Dr. Judd. Dr. Graves *endorsed* that—*published* it to the world in book form to aid the Baptist cause. To *what next best authority*, then, could we appeal? Our Greek lexicons—all on *our side*,—*all* sustaining affusion are with us. All Hebrew lexicography is with us. All the classics are with us. Authorities are with us. But it hurts him worst that the *grand old Syriac* is with us—ay, and so squarely. Rain baptizing, tears baptizing couches, baptizing Christ's feet—ay, it must be silenced, for this Peshito, like the Bard's Duncan—"like a naked, new-born babe, striding the blasts, or heaven's cherubim horsed upon the sightless courier of the wind," will fill the land with rebellion against the reign of water over the minds of the people. It *must* be silenced. And *Jesus himself interprets the mode of baptism—that* hurts. *He*—"in his *native Syro-Chaldee*," as A. Campbell calls it, *calls admitted affusion—a light sprinkle—baptism—"My feet hath she baptized with her TEARS.*

Dr. Graves, in speech 8th, says: "Does Turretine sustain Elder D?" Turretine uses almost word for word the *same* language of Witsius, and gives the same examples. He believes John immersed. He says baptidzo also means to sprinkle (*adspergo, profundo*) and that the 3,000, on Pentecost, Paul, Lydia, the 5,000, Acts iv, were all baptized by sprinkling. But as he uses almost verbatim Witsius' words, we give them:

"HERMANN WITSIUS has been paraded by the immersionists as a special favorite. They often begin their list with his great name. Campbell quotes him as sustaining their views. I hold his work in my hands, the "De Œconomia Fœderum Dei," etc., Hermannii Wital, MDCLXXXV. It is quite venerable—nearly two hundred years old. In

book iv, lib. 4, ch. 16, § 13, 14, he discusses this question: "Whether by immersion or also by pouring water out of a vase, or sprinkling, was the rite of baptism administered. He admits that "it cannot be denied but that *bapto* and *baptidzo* may mean to sink (*mergere*), and to moisten or dip." But he says, § 14, p. 672 (de Baptismo), "Yet it is not to be supposed that immersion is necessary to baptism, since it may be accomplished by pouring or sprinkling—*ut perfusione vel aspersione*." After explaining further, he says—and I will render it literally, as I only have the Latin copy: "It is more probable that the three thousand who were baptized in one day, Acts ii, 41, were *perfused* (poured on) or sprinkled with water than that they were immersed. For it is not likely that the men engaged in the preaching of the word as the apostles were, with ever so much pains, could immerse so many thousands. Neither is it credible that Cornelius, and Lydia, and those who were baptized in their own private houses, had baptisteries at hand, in which they could be totally immersed. Vossius adduces examples of pouring from antiquity, Disput. 1, in his treatise on baptism, etc. 2. It is admitted that *baptidzein* may properly signify to sink, yet also it takes the more general signification of washing in any way whatsoever, as for example Luke ix, 38, etc. 3. The thing signified by baptism is set forth both in the Old and New Testament by the words *pour* and *sprinkle*. See Isa. xlv, 3, concerning pouring; Isa. lii, 15; Ezek. xxxvi, 25; Heb. xii, 24; 1 Pet. i, 2, on sprinkling."

Dr. G. asks, "Does Dr. A. Clarke sustain his (D's) position?" "Does Beza?" "Does Lightfoot?" He makes me say that Witsius, Beza, etc., etc., sustain me in the "assertion that *baptidzo* means primarily and properly to sprinkle." I said nothing of the kind. I did say and showed that all the old school traced *sprinkle* from wash—refuted their theory. I showed that *the facts* compelled all of them to state that *baptidzo* applied to affusions. That they held it meant to sprinkle, but accounted for it on unscientific grounds, as the immersionists do. But he expresses astonishment, and thinks I risk my reputation as a scholar. Now,

1. What are our positions? Dr. G. is to prove that *baptidzo* ALWAYS implies immersion—never sprinkle or pour, I am to refute it. Now let us quote those authors he names as sustaining him.

ED. ROBINSON: "*Baptidzo* In Hellenistic Geeek, and in reference to the rite of baptism . . . expressed not always immersion, but the more general idea of *ablution* or *affusion*."—Gr. Lex., *sub voce*. He then shows that all the facts and ancient excavated baptisteries, etc., prove that it was by affusion.

BAUMGARTEN, one among the ablest commentators of Europe, says: "The baptism of Saul followed *immediately* the receiving of his sight. Upon calling upon that holy name, his body is baptized by means of the water poured upon him."—Acts ix, 1-36. Vol. i, 238, 239.

"He ordered all those who had received the Holy Spirit, to be baptized with water."—Acts x, 47.

"With a part of the same water" used in washing the apostles, "the prison keeper and all his were baptized without the dipping of the whole body, in the open, running water."—Acts xvi, 11-40. Vol ii, 134.

OLSHAUSEN, one of the greatest and best commentators of any age, and the most impartial and profound, says on John iii, 25-27: "The dispute was on baptism—*Katharismos*, equivalent to *baptisma* (baptism)." Mark vii, 4: "Ablutions of all sorts, among the rest those applicable to the priest (Ex. xxix, 4; 18, sq. with Heb. ix, 10), were common among the Jews. *Baptismos* is here, as in Heb. ix, 10, *ablution*, *washing* generally; *klinai* here, couches on which the ancients were wont to recline at meals." Here he held that the legal sprinklings of John iii, 25-27; of the priests, Exodus xxix, 4, etc., were the "diverse baptisms" of Paul, Heb. ix, 10. That the couches of dining were baptized as the Jews did—by affusion. Again:

On Acts ii, he considers the three thousand were baptized by sprinkling. Vol. iv, 383: "The difficulty can only be removed by supposing that they already employed mere *sprinkling*," etc.

LIGHTFOOT'S Commentary is only for the learned, like the above, written in Latin. That he holds the highest rank of scholarship, is admitted by all: "The word, therefore *baptismous* (washing), applied to all these (brazen vessels, beds, etc.—Mark vii, 4), properly, and strictly is not to be taken of *dipping* or *plunging* [*italics his*], but, in respect of some things, of washing only, and, in respect of others, *SPRINKLING* only."—*Horæ Heb. et Tal.*, tom. ii, 419.

STIER: "*Baptidzo* occurs frequently in the sense of mere washing." He supposes, at times, they may have been "dipped," where, otherwise, baptism would be administered by sprinkling, as probably with the thousands on the day of Pentecost.

He is inferior to no commentator—one of the greatest and most voluminous.—"*Leben Jesu*," vol. vii, 303, note.

WESLEY: The immersionists have been misquoting Wesley, Adam Clarke, and Watson, for years, especially the two former, just as they do Witsius, Beza, and the rest. But Wesley is quoted as favoring *their* idea as against ours, else why quote him? Here is Wesley's note on Mark vii, 4: "*Washing of cups and pots and brazen vessels and couches*—the Greek word (baptisms) (i. e. *baptismous*—*baptidzo*) means indifferently either washing or sprinkling."

On Matt. iii, 6: Wesley says, in his notes: "Such prodigious numbers could hardly be baptized by immersing their whole bodies under water;

nor can we think they were provided with change of raiment for it, which was scarce practicable for such vast multitudes." He then urges that they must have been baptized by affusion.

GEO. HILL: "Both sprinkling and immersion are implied in the word *baptidzo*, both are used in the religious ceremonies of the Jews."—"Lectures on Divinity, 659."

A. CLARKE: "In what form baptism was originally administered, has been deemed a subject worthy of serious dispute. Were the people *dipped* or sprinkled? for it is certain *bapto* and *baptidzo* mean both."—On Matt. iii, 6.

BLOOMFIELD, Gr. Test., Mark vii, 4. "This is best explained, 'unless they wash their bodies,' in opposition to the washing of the *hands* before mentioned, in which, however, is not implied immersion. Heb. vi, 2, "Always in the sense of washing," here "as a general term referring both to the Jewish and Christian baptisms." Heb. ix, 10, "*Bap* denotes those ceremonial ablutions of various sorts, some respecting the *priests*, others the *people at large*, detailed in Leviticus and Numbers."

Acts viii, 38. "Philip seems to have taken up water with his hands and poured it copiously on the Eunuch's head."

ALFORD, Gr. Test., Mark vii, 4, "*Baptizontai* (baptize) themselves; but probably not the washing of their whole bodies;" v. 8, "The *baptismoi* as applied to *klinoi* (couches at meals) were certainly not *immersions* but *sprinklings* or *affusions* of water."

On Acts ii, 41, Alford holds that the 3,000 were sprinkled.

Luke xi, 38, "Did not imply necessary immersion of the whole body, for it was only the hands which the Pharisees washed before meat."

FAIRBAIRN: "The diverse evidently points to the several uses of water, such as we know to have actually existed under the law, *sprinklings*, *washings*, *bathings*."

Here you see we are sustained completely and the Doctor routed.

Beza says *baptidzo* means also to moisten (*madefacere*) and wash. What he means by his wash and moisten, he shows on Acts i, 5—"baptized with water—with the Spirit. He says of the water: "The other is spoken ('baptized with water') of water *POURED* (*aquæ effusæ*) upon the people." Does this sustain the Doctor, or me? Beza was the best Greek critic of the 16th century.

The Doctor quotes Vattel on Laws of Nations, 8th speech, and urges that notification must take place before a change in law and custom is admissible.

1. But we showed that sprinkle is the primary meaning of *baptidzo*. By primary, Havernick, Fairbairn, Jahn, Gesenius, etc.—all critics and Webster, tell us is meant *the original* meaning, affixed to the word by those who invented it—first used it.

2. We showed that *dip* is *no* meaning of *baptidzo*, and immerse a rare one by *two* proofs. 1. The whole immersion body of writers. 2. By an appeal to “the ultimate authorities.” 3. We find that the lexicons nowhere furnish a text to support immerse earlier than Polybius. Hence immerse is a developed, late meaning. 4. We demonstrated by all philology—by the science of language—that immerse is the late, the derived meaning. Hence, Vattel’s law destroys the Doctor.—[*Time out.*]

DR. GRAVES' TENTH SPEECH.

The Use of Baptidzo by Classic Greek Authors.

MR. PRESIDENT: —I shall now examine the meaning of *baptidzo* as used by Greek authors before, in the age of, and after Christ. Let it be borne in mind that when we appeal to Greek authors we appeal to the highest authority known to scholars. It is higher authority than lexicons. It is where lexicographers go to find the meanings they give in their lexicons. It is the supreme court by which the meaning of words is irreversibly decided. It must be admitted by all sensible men that the Greeks knew their own language. In what signification, then, did they *invariably* use *baptidzo*, in its physical or literal sense?

I repeat, to keep distinctly before you, the law of interpretation by which we have agreed to be governed, viz., the "primary or literal meaning is the only true meaning, and we must, in every instance, use it unless the context forbids." Now, I am here to prove that the primary or literal meaning of *baptidzo*, *at the time* it was selected by the Holy Spirit—as it was for ages and ever before, as it has been ever since—was "to immerse," "to dip," or a kindred meaning.

These exhaust the use of the word in Greek literature. Dr. Conant's translation of these examples have not been questioned by any scholar, if so, I have not heard of it.

I shall select my examples from Dr. Conant's *Baptidzein*, the most valuable contribution made to *our* baptismal literature in any age. He has made it a part of the study of a lifetime to gather from his own reading, and every instance of the use of baptize in, by Greek writers whose works are extant.

The first example I will introduce is

EXAMPLE 4.

From Aristotle, who was born three hundred and eighty-four years before Christ.

"They say that the Phœnicians who inhabit the so-called Gadira, sail-

ing four days outside of the Pillars of Hercules with an east-wind, came to certain desert places full of rushes and sea-weed; which, when it is ebb-tide, are not—*baptizesthai*—immersed, baptized, but when it is floodtide are overflowed.”—*Aristotle, concerning Wonderful Reports*, 136.

What is the evident meaning of the term in this place, sprinkled, poured, or immersed? You have heard Elder Ditzler affirm emphatically a full half score of times, that *baptidzo* was never used to denote immersion before Polybius; that it meant sprinkle before his day. But Aristotle was born one hundred and seventy-nine years before Polybius!

Mr. President, the verb *baptidzo* never meant to sprinkle, nor can he produce the shadow of authority to sustain such a statement, and I challenge him to do so.

EXAMPLE 6.

My next shall be Polybius himself.

“Polybius, History, book XXXIV, c. 3, 7. In his description of the manner of taking the sword-fish (with an iron-headed spear or harpoon), he says: ‘And even if the spear falls into thesea, it is not lost; for it is compacted of both oak and pine, so that when the oaken part *baptizomenon*—is immersed, baptized by the weight, the rest is buoyed up and easily recovered.’”

EXAMPLE 7.

“*Ibid.* III, ch. 72, 4. Speaking of the passage of the Roman army, under the Consul Tiberius, through the river Tebia, which had been swollen by heavy rains, he says: ‘They passed through with difficulty, the foot-soldiers—*baptizomenoi*—immersed, as far as to the breasts.’”

Can the word be translated in either of these two instances otherwise than immersed? Are sprinkled or poured admissible? Evidently not. The context demands immersion.

EXAMPLE 11.

My next author is Strabo, who was born sixty years before Christ.

“Strabo’s Geography, book XIV, ch. 3, 9. ‘Alexander happening to be there at the stormy season, and accustomed to trust for the most part to fortune, set forward before the swell subsided; and they marched the whole day in water—*mechri omphalou baptizomenon*—immersed, (baptized) as far as the waist.’”

Can it possibly mean anything else than immersion here?

EXAMPLE 15.

Diodorus, who wrote sixty to thirty years before Christ, in his *Hist. Lib.*

book XI, ch. 18, says: "The commander of the fleet, leading on the line, and first joining battle, was slain after a brilliant conflict; and his ship being submerged (baptized) confusion seized the fleet of the barbarians."

Does it mean that the commander's ship was only sprinkled with a little water here, or wholly immersed? Mark what he will make of this case.

Having shown its use ages before and in the time of Christ, for all Greek writers yet discovered from the earliest age until the Christian Era use *baptidzo* in the same sense as these I have given, I will examine a few who wrote in the days of the apostles and after, while the Greek continued to be a spoken language.

Josephus, a learned Jew, familiar with the Greek language, was born thirty-seven years after Christ.

EXAMPLE 16.

In his antiquities, Book xv, ch. 3, 3, describing the murder of the boy Aristobulus, who (by Herod's command) was drowned by his companions in a swimming bath, he says:

"Continually pressing down and immersing [baptizing] him while swimming, as if in sport, they did not desist till they had entirely suffocated him."

Here is a clear case of frequent immersions and no death from the first. My opponent, who boasts that he never makes a mistake as to facts, has asserted in your hearing that "no case can be found in classic Greek where a single immersion of a living person did not result in death;" that it is used invariably in the sense of *drown*—sinking to the bottom and remaining there. If the first immersion sufficed to drown the boy, why did they repeat it continually? Does not this disprove his assertion? If not, take

EXAMPLE 156.

Polyænus,* *Stratagems*, book IV, ch. 2, 6. The device by which Philip King of the Macedon, while exercising in the wrestling-school with Menegetes the pancratiast,† evaded the importunities of his soldiers, who had gathered around clamoring for their pay.

"Philip, not having it, came forward streaming with sweat, covered with dust, and smiling on them said: You say justly, fellow-soldiers,

* About the middle of the second century after Christ.

† The name for an expert in both wrestling and boxing.

but indeed, for this very purpose I am myself now anointed against the barbarian, in order that I may many times over repay you thanks. Saying this, and clapping his hands, he ran through the midst and threw himself into the swimming-bath; and the Macedonians laughed. Philip did not give over DIPPING (BAPTIZING) IN A MATCH with the pancratiast, and sprinkling water in the face, until the soldiers wearied out, dispersed.

This play was the Dipping-match, it was a mutual dipping of each other—*certatim immargo*. • Dr. Conant describes it in a note thus:

“This was the *dipping match*, or game of *dipping each other*; each party striving to prove his superior strength and agility by putting the other under the water, and also by splashing it in his face (*‘sprinkling water in the face’*) till he was deprived of breath.”

Now, here were repeated immersions, “clear under the water,” with the sprinkling of water into the face added; hundreds of immersions did not destroy life.

EXAMPLE 22.

Jewish War, book III., ch. x, 9. He says of the Jews, in describing their contest with the Roman soldiers on the sea of Gallilee:

“And when they ventured to come near, they suffered harm before they could inflict any, and were submerged [baptized] along with their vessels, and those of the submerged [baptized] soldiers who raised their heads, either a missile reached, or a vessel overtook.”

If the mere baptizing of a living person destroys life, how, then, could these submerged soldiers ever raise their heads out of the water? Could dead men do it?

Once more.

EXAMPLE 30.

Hippocrates, on Epidemics, book V. Describing the respiration of a patient, affected with inflammation and swelling of the throat [*Cynache*], and oppression about the heart, he says: “And she breathed, as persons breathe after having been immersed, [baptized], and emitted a loud sound from the chest, like the so-called ventriloquist.”

If no living person was ever immersed and survived, how could this writer say that the patient breathed like one “after having been immersed?” If Eld. Ditzler’s assertion is true, no man ever did breathe after having been immersed. He makes no mistakes as to facts, *he* says, what do you say?

How, now, about his bold assertion that he has repeated all

over the South, and so often since the beginning of this debate, and that has been received by so many as settling this baptismal question against the Baptists?!

There is another case,

EXAMPLE 59.

In Polybius, Hist. book V, ch. xlvii, 2. Speaking of a body of cavalry sent by Molon to attack Xenoctas, in a position where he was partly protected by the river Tigris, and partly by marshes and pools, he says: "Who, coming into near proximity with the forces of Xenoctas, through ignorance of the localities required no enemy, but themselves by themselves immersed [baptized] and sinking in the pools, were all useless, and many of them also perished."

These soldiers were all *immersed* in mud and water; and all were rendered useless, but only some perished; why not *all*, if Eld. Ditzler's assertion is true, *i. e.*, "that no living person was ever spoken of as baptized, in classic Greek, and survived?"

My eye falls upon yet another.

EXAMPLE 65.

Plutarch, in his work, Gryllas, VII, says of Agamemnon, King of the Greeks, on his way to Troy: "Then bravely—*baptizon eis ten Coparda timnen*—plunging, [baptizing] himself into the lake Copais, that there he might extinguish his love, and be freed from desire."

I wish my opponent to answer two questions.

1. According to his own rule laid down in the debate with Eld. Wilkes, did you not say that *eis* with the accusative implied entrance within—*i. e.*, an immersion into water, and have we not *eis* with the accusative here, and was not King Agamemnon wholly immersed into the lake?

2. Did he or did he not survive and go on to the Trojan war after this?

Mark if he will answer these. Where, now, is his boasted and oft-repeated assertion, in the face of these clear examples, that no man can find an example in classic Greek where a living being was ever immersed and survived? I have fully disproved his assertion by these half dozen examples, while *one* was sufficient. What will his unsupported assertions amount to after this?

While my first aim has been to establish the use of *baptidzo*

in classic Greek, I have overthrown his strong position against Baptists at the same time. I have yet time to read a few more authors.

I wish also to call attention to the Greek text, which is translated—sprinkling water in his face, it is not *rainomenos ton prosopon*—*raino* followed by a direct object without a preposition, sprinkling the *face*, which is an impossibility; but sprinkling water, *kata prosopon*, in or against the face,” which also sustains my canon.

Homeric Allegories, ch. 9.

EXAMPLE 71.

The writer explains the ground of the allegory [as he calls it] of Neptune freeing Mars from Vulcan, thus: “Since the mass of iron, drawn red-hot from the furnace, is plunged [baptized] in water; and the fiery glow, by its own nature quenched with water, ceases.”

Will my opponent presume to say that the mass of red-hot iron was here cooled by sprinkling water upon it? We have here *baptidzo* with the dative without the preposition (*hudato baptizetai*) as we have in Luke, the dative of element, or answering to the question “wherein.” If *baptidzo* means to sprinkle here, then was the red-hot mass of *iron* sprinkled into the water, and not the *water* upon the iron. He must change the text or translate it as Conant does.

Another case just in point.

EXAMPLE 86.

Æsopic Fables; fable of the Man and the Fox. “A certain man, having a grudge against a fox for certain mischief done by her, after getting her into his power contrived a long time how to punish her; and dipping [baptizing] tow in oil, he bound it to her tail and set fire to it.”

We have, in this example, the phrase “*kai stupeion elaiο baptisas*,” the dative of element with the verb *baptidzo* as we had in Luke iii, 16. Will Eld. Ditzler translate this “sprinkled the tow with the oil,” or “poured the tow with the oil” as he so stoutly insisted the similar phrase in Luke should be rendered? He would be sent to the foot of his class in any third-rate grammar school of the land. His theory compels him to translate this “sprinkled the oil *on* the tow,” but cannot make the text read so—*elaiο* is here manifestly the dative of element, and must be translated in oil. He cannot

parse his translation by the rules of any Greek grammar ever written. He has shown a disposition to treat my canon lightly; here is an excellent opportunity to explode it if he can do it. I challenge him to the contest; now let him accept my challenge, or admit my position.

I leave, here, the examination of classic Greek writers, having given you a few out of the eighty-six similar ones given by Conant of its *literal* use, and with no other have we to do; and I distinctly challenge Eld. Ditzler to produce a single example from the writings of any Greek author in which *baptidzo* occurs in its literal sense having any other meaning than "to immerse," "to dip," "to plunge," or a kindred meaning. This is the time and the place to do it. If he is unable to do it, he signally fails to support his "sprinkling," and leaves the argument with me.

[Replication.]

I shall confine myself to but a few points in my opponent's last speech.

1. The most of what he said was for present effect with the audience, or for the unthinking and credulous who may read this discussion. All thinking men, and for such alone I speak, know that bold assertions, and vehement assertions, unsupported by reliable evidence, amount to nothing. He claims that all the lexicons, and all classic writers, and all critics and all the learned men, are with him and against immersion! I will test these statements, each and several, when I reach the lexicons to-morrow, in the due course of the debate, and as for his "grand old Syriac Version," we will see of what force it is, and whose cause that force is in favor of—when I reach my argument from Ancient Versions. Elder D. can afford, it seems, to repeat himself daily, and in each speech, over and over, but I cannot, nor do I intend he shall force me to repeat more than I think will give due emphasis to some facts. As often as he claims all, or any lexicon in support of sprinkling as a proper or primary meaning of *baptidzo*, I can properly, as now, challenge him to produce one that does so, giving us the text of his author. He has not, after so many challenges,

produced one, he will not, for he cannot. We are now examining the use of *baptidzo* by Greek writers, and I can properly challenge him to produce one who manifestly uses *baptidzo* in its physical, literal signification, in the sense of to sprinkle upon. He has not done so—he cannot, and will not, but seek to mislead you from the main to side issues, as he has from the first.

But to the special points.

1. He says that the commission is in figurative language, “very much so!” No sentence is *figurative* unless it contains a figure of speech. No man ever found a figure in the commission—he cannot do so, and therefore he mistakes as to a plain matter of fact here.

The Savior clearly told them whom to baptize—*autous*—them—*i. e.*, the disciples—they made in obeying his command to *matheteusate*—make disciples. What figure here? That, literally, you cannot *sprinkle* or *pour* a living being or a solid substance, but that whenever a noun denoting a person, or indivisible object, the preposition on or upon must be expressed or understood.

2. That he affects to despise my canon, and attempts to escape its force by ridicule—it is A. Campbell’s—it is ridiculous—a “thin conceit”—surrendered long ago by immersionists in Kentucky, etc. All this sort of talk, with no evidence produced to overthrow it, amounts to nothing, but is proof that he *feels* the force of the canon.

The principle on which this canon is based, has been known to all scholars in all ages, for it inheres in the very signification of the words themselves. Dr. Geo. Campbell, who wrote before A. Campbell was born, recognized it, in this statement :

“The word *baptism*, both in sacred authors and in classical, signifies to dip, to plunge, to immerse. Had *baptidzo* been employed in the same sense of *raino*, to sprinkle (which as as far as I know it never is, in any use sacred or classical), the expression would doubtless have been, ‘ I INDEED BAPTIZE WATER UPON YOU.’ ”

I am, perhaps bringing it out, illustrating and making it more prominent in this debate than any one before me has done, and it is because it is a putting the matter in a way that the com-

mon people can understand it, and with this argument alone they can successfully meet my opponent or any other sprinkler, and refute them.

I suppose it was surrendered by the immersionists of Kentucky the day they surrendered the State to Elder D., furled their banners, and laid down their arms at his victorious feet—never before. I wish him to know, that Tennessee immersionists have not surrendered it, nor are they ashamed of it.

To his profound remark that “there are verbs that take two accusatives,” I bow with the utmost deference; but what it has to do in refuting my cause, I do not imagine! Does he mean that the verbs in question—sprinkle, to pour—take two accusatives without a preposition expressed or understood? Of what pertinency his remark, if he did not mean this—or if he did?

I, nor any other man, ever held that nouns without a preposition could not be the direct objects of the verbs—to wet, to moisten, to stain, to color, etc.,—but I do deny that any verb, whose proper meaning is to sprinkle or to pour, means primarily to color, to stain—or that any verb denoting to scatter, to sprinkle, to diffuse, to pour, can literally and without an ellipse, take an indivisible noun—as a person—for its direct object without a preposition being expressed or understood.

He has referred to passages in the Old and New Testaments, to sustain him, and, therefore, I propose here to examine them, and to show you that the Holy Spirit, in inditing the Word of God, honors my canon.

1. The first place in which sprinkle is used, taking a person as a direct object, is in Lev. xiv, 7: “And he shall sprinkle, *al*, upon him that is cleansed,” etc.

2. The next place is Lev. xiv, 51: “And he shall sprinkle, *al*, upon the house seven times.” Our English translators did not translate this preposition, but the Holy Spirit put it there, in the original—for He was giving a law, and it must be expressed in literal, not figurative, terms.

3. The third time it is used is in Lev. xvi, 14: “And he shall take the blood of the bullock and sprinkle with his finger,

al, upon the mercy-seat eastward," etc. In this case, there could have been no mistake had it read, sprinkle the mercy-seat, and according to the rules governing figures, an ellipsis might have been employed, but the Holy Spirit was giving a law.

4. The fourth case occurs in Numbers xix, 18: "Take his sop and dip it in the water, and sprinkle, *al*, upon the tent, and, *al*, upon him that touched a bone," etc.

5. The fifth, is the 13th verse: "The water of separation was not sprinkled, *al*, upon him."

6. The sixth instance is in the 19th verse: "Shall sprinkle it, *al*, on him."

These show that the preposition following such verbs, before indivisible objects, is expressed in the Hebrew generally, as it is in the Syriac and Greek versions of it. He instances one case in New Testament Greek, Heb. ix, 10: "He sprinkled the book and the people," etc., which is clearly an example of an ellipsis, but if he will but open his "grand old Syriac," he will to his amazement find *al*, upon the book, as it is in the Hebrew to which it refers.

What though Origen and Basil did say the altar was immersed, they manifestly used the term *tropically*, indicating the *effect*, rather than the act by which it was produced. But by what right does he say that David baptized his couch with his tears, and that Mary baptized the Savior's feet with her tears? The Holy Spirit does not say so, in either place, nor does He use, in either case, a verb that is used in connection with baptism! It is *brecho*—to wet—in both cases! He has no right under heaven to translate that word *baptize*, and I must say I scorn the motive that prompts him to use it in these cases.

On the Definition of Words.

I may as well here as in my next argument, say what I have to say touching the true and *real* definitions of words. I am convinced that my opponent has no clear idea of what constitutes the real or literal definition of words, or, he has the past

three days intentionally sought to confuse your minds as to what they are.

He has, as you all know, in every speech he has made, as in his last, blended and confounded the figurative with the literal and proper meanings of verbs. He has, in every speech, quoted the remotest figurative meanings of verbs, given by his lexicons, and stoutly asserted that these were as truly real meanings as those given as the primary significations. You have just heard him claim that "to soak in liquor," "to intoxicate," "to drown," "to puzzle or perplex with a multitude of questions," are each and all, real definitions of *baptidzo*! I affirm, most emphatically, that they are not proper definitions at all, and he ought to know it, or knowing it, he cares little for his reputation for candor or scholarship, to stand here and affirm they are.

I am determined that you shall not be confused and misled by his assertions, unless you are more than willing to be.

What is the definition of a definition? In other words, what are you to understand by a *proper* definition of words? The Rules of Interpreting language, which, at the outstart, we mutually endorsed, tell us what it is. It is not any ideal or fanciful meaning that poets or orators may give it. Nor can a figure of speech be considered a real definition of any term.

What say the Rules?

I. *Every word must have some specific idea or notion, which we call meaning.* Were not this so, words would be meaningless and useless.

II. The *literal*, which is also called the *grammatical sense* of a word, is the sense so connected with it that it is first in order, and is spontaneously presented to the mind as soon as the sound is heard. This meaning is *always* (save in one lexicon, *i. e.*, *Stokius*) placed first in the lexicons, and is known as the *primary* meaning.

III. "THE PRIMARY OR LITERAL MEANING IS THE ONLY TRUE ONE."
—*Ernesti*, p. 14.

Ernesti quotes Morus in support of this:

"There can be no certainty at all in respect to the interpretation of any passage, unless a kind of necessity compels us to affix a particular sense to a word: which sense, as I have before said, must be *one*; and unless there

are special reasons for a *tropical* (or secondary) meaning, it **MUST BE THE LITERAL SENSE,**" i. e., the primary.

I therefore lay down this canon, strange, though it may sound to my opponent, and though never before developed in discussion.

FROM THE PHYSICAL USE OF WORDS ALONE, AND NOT FROM THEIR FIGURATIVE, CAN WE LEARN THEIR REAL AND PROPER MEANINGS.

To claim that the figurative use and meanings of words are their proper and true ones, would be to confound all language, and any sentence or law could be construed to mean what the fancy of men might suggest.

Let us notice how secondary meanings originate by *figures* of speech.

1. By *Synecdoche*, in which a part is put for the whole, or *vice versa*—e. g., "The baptism of John," Acts xix, 14, put for the preaching or ministry of John—but is preaching or ministry, therefore, a definition of baptism?

2. By *Metonymy*, in which one thing is put for another—as effect, for cause, the container for that which is contained, etc., etc.—e. g., when speaking of a person we say "baptized in tears," immersed in ills and woes, overwhelmed with taxation, buried, immersed in his books, etc. But who will say that to cry is a proper signification of to *baptize*? or to tax heavily, of the verb overwhelm? or to study diligently, of the verb *immerse*?

3. By *Hyperbole*, which expresses 'much more or less than the truth—David "bathed his couch with his tears"—caused his "bed to swim with tears"—the frog dyed all the lake with his blood—he was dipped or immersed in dew; he baptized the nations in blood and carnage.

If then, we may not learn the real meaning of words from their tropical uses, then their figurative or metaphorical definitions, which are always placed as a secondary meaning in the lexicons, are not the *real* and literal meanings, and we should not look for the real and true among the figurative uses of a word.

Now, by this canon I shall be governed in this discussion. I charge my opponent before the world and the republic of letters, that he has, from his first to his last speech, claimed and asserted that the figurative definitions of *baptidzo* in the lexicons are, equally with the primary, real definitions, and, judging from his practice, superior, and to be preferred to the primary, for he uses them altogether to the neglect of the primary.

I emphatically deny that any of the meanings of *baptidzo* that he has brought forward in this debate are real meanings of the verb at all; and in the estimation of all scholars and intelligent thinking persons he should surrender the whole question, unless he comes to the front with the primary or real definitions of the verb.

I was expecting that my opponent would have conducted this debate on his part upon true, scientific, logical and philological principles, but thus far he persistently and proudly refuses to recognize them, and even charges such men as Prof. Moses Stuart, of Andover, the recognized scholar of the Congregationalists, in his day, with "impiricism!" His speeches and replies are marked with the utter want of method, induction or logic.—[*Time out.*

DR. DITZLER'S TENTH REPLY.

On Dr. Conant's statements that he had exhausted the use of *baptidzo* &c., in the Greek—given every occurrence of it in all the ancient Greek writers up to the 10th century &c., we refer you to his omission of it in Origen's baptism of the altar. Basil's account of it, Clemens Alexandrinus' words—"the Jews daily baptize on a couch," all yet to be detailed, and Eusebius' citation from Clemens Alex. where John, the Apostle, met the backslider, who was "baptized, as it were, a second time with tears." These are *very important* omissions, all being Greek writers of the early centuries of the Christian era, 190, 215, etc.

But Dr. G. thinks *baptidzo* does mean to *dip*—applies to such act as *they* perform in baptizing. We emphatically assert that not a place in ancient Greek—classic Greek, can be found where *baptidzo* applies to any such act, or means to dip. He cites examples out of Conant, 22, 26, 25, 39, 69, 70, 86, to show that living objects are *immersed* yet do not perish, as well as that *baptidzo* is to *dip*, put under and withdraw immediately. Now let us examine these, the strongest supports they have, and if they fail to give *dip*, his cause is gone forever, while if they *did*, it shows it is *the rarest* of all meanings.

I take them as they come in Conant, as given by Dr. G. He cited No. 2 first, I believe. The ship here he says "*being submerged, (baptidzomena—baptized)* became filled with sea-water and with *confusion*." Whence arose the confusion? Was it not the confusion of *men* on the ship baptized? Now if the ship was "*submerged,*" *wholly* under the water, how could men remain on it and exhibit confusion? Evidently the ship *was not* submerged, but only baptized with waves leaping upon it. And if they *were* "*filled with sea-water,*" *did they not sink*—go down forever? We freely admit that in *later* Greek, Polybius, Plutarch, &c., it sometimes means to *sink*—(*immergo*).

No vessel, ship ever survived on earth *at sea*, becoming “filled with sea-water.” This, then, perfectly *sustains* our position.

His second case is in late, iron age Greek, Josephus, where on the sea of Galilee, a very tempestuous little sea, the Jews “were submerged (baptized) along with their vessels.” Now if their vessels *went down*, were *submerged*, they perished, man and vessels. He adds: “And those of the *submerged* (baptized) who raised their heads, either a missile reached or a vessel overtook,” Conant’s rendering p. 10. But Conant’s rendering is a false rendering. He renders it as if it was an active verb, indicative mood—they raised their heads *after* being “submerged.” It is most outrageous. It is a participle—*tous ananeuontas*, the heads, it implies the elevation of all the part of a man’s shoulder as well as head, that a swimmer has above water—“their heads being elevated.” Hence it reads: The heads [and of course part of the shoulder] of those baptized being elevated, etc.” Now “the heads of those submerged” cannot be elevated *above* the water when *the whole is submerged*. So his *test* texts *refute* his position. No. 25 is in doubt as to correctness of the Greek, hence can’t decide a doubtful point, since *two* doubts do not clear away a third doubt. “The soldiers baptized themselves (*ek*) *out of* great wine cups, etc.” So far from this being *dip in*, it is *baptize out of*, (*ek pithon megalon*.) They became *drunk*, baptized, as Plato and others use *baptidzo* for “make drunk;” they did so [*ek*] *out of*, not *in* the “wine-jars, etc.” There is no *dip* here. Soldiers do not hesitate to drink out of cups or wine-jars with the mouth we know. In Aristophanes it occurs once. It is metaphorically for aspersing, abusing, pouring abuse upon the stewards, baptizing them with abuse. We use asperse, foul aspersion, torrent of abuse, pour abuse upon, for this very act here described by *baptidzo*. He fails still to even jar our position.

He next introduces example 39, p. 18 of Conant. “And already *becoming immersed* [*baptized*] and wanting little of *sinking*, some of the pirates at first attempted to leave, and get aboard of their own bark.” A “storm” up—pirates seize a vessel—it, Conant says, “becoming immersed”—that is *sunk*—“becoming *sunk*”—baptized. Now how could the ves-

sel be *clear under*, as you immerse men, when it adds: "*and wanting little of sinking—being immersed?*" It reads thus: "But being ALREADY baptized [*i. e.* with waves leaping upon it—*affusion*] *and wanting little of being* IMMERSED—more literally—wanting little of immersing—sinking—some of the pirates," etc. Here then, 1. though baptized, the vessel *was not immersed*. 2. The vessel was baptized, yet "*some of the pirates—not all—were attempting to leave.*" Now can that be said of a vessel "*already immersed.*" If *all* the vessel was under water, how could some of the pirates be *attempting to leave* it? They would be either *under* water with it, else left floating when it had sunk. But, 3. It does not say all or a *part had deserted* the vessel. "*At first*"—while it was baptized—"some attempted to leave—by little boats no doubt—and to get aboard their own bark." Thus all the facts show, and *the very words* show that *baptidzo* here *does not* immerse the vessel. It "*still wanted a little of immersing—katadunai*" N. 63, p. 33, comes nearer than any Greek sentence in iron age Greek of supporting *dip* as a meaning of *baptidzo*. If it does, it is *the only place in all the Greek known to man* where it means *dip—the very meaning you want*—Carson saying it "*ALWAYS means to dip,*" and A. Campbell, "*wherever you find bap—the stem syllable—there you find dip.*"

1st. Then, there is no reliability in the Greek text of Josephus here. It has been tampered with badly by immersionist editors for centuries. See Conant, 33 even.

2d. It reads very differently *on this very point* in different editions. Hence all is in doubt about it. The truest reading, the recognized one is: "and baptizing a little of the ashes of it—the burnt heifer—in water—that is, pouring a little of the ashes into a fountain of water (*in aquam-baptisantes*) * * * *eis paegaen*, they sprinkled," etc. There is no *dip* here, it is rather the reverse; a little of the ashes was cast or poured into water. Conant adopts a false reading: "*suggested by Bonfrer, on Num. xix,*" where he thinks there was "an error in copying." In a word, a couple of immersionists make a verse of Greek of their own, that is, etymologically, and properly contrary to every use of it known, and by it support

dip, as if Josephus were the author! And *that* is the best they *can* do for their mode of baptism!

The other two cases are square against them. The one (70) in Conant, baptize the Egyptian blister plaster, now substituted by a pessary vastly different in material, shape and purpose, in or with "the milk of a woman," (*es gala gunaikos*.) Case 71—the mass of iron drawn by the smiths red-hot from the furnace, is *baptized with water*—*hudatiabaptidzetai*. Now,

1st. It is a red-hot *mass* of iron from the furnace. Such is *never* plunged into water, it would throw every drop out of the tub and scald the smiths.

2d. It is a *mass* of red-hot iron, so large that *smiths* [plural in Greek] have to handle it. Such a "mass drawn red-hot out of the furnace" is never plunged into water.

3d. It reads baptized [*hudati*] *with* water, dative of instrument, not *eis hudor*, into or in water.

4th. Smiths always sprinkle or lightly pour on water to temper down a large mass of hot iron. "The fiery glow" thus "quenched *with* water [*hudati*, again] ceases." There is *No dip in baptidzo*; not at all.

One more text he adduced—86, p. 42 in Conant.

"It is a fictitious work, the 'writer and date unknown.'"—*Conant*.

Conant reads, "*dipping* tow in oil." Now the fox's tail was not dipped in oil [Mr. D. here said fox's tail for tow, tied to its tail—a *lapsus lingue*] but *elaio baptizas*, was baptized *with* oil. Evidently it was no *dipping*. Any way, it is not allowable to take one extremely doubtful text as to meaning, to *settle another* that is in doubt. It was simply baptized *with* oil—dative of instrument, no *en* even, though it would not be proof, as even *en eloio* often occurs, *many* times, where the oil was *poured*. So the learned gentleman has exhausted his skill after he took days and nights to prepare his assault on my first hour's speech, and failed utterly, even to raise a clever smoke or cloud of dust.

ON SOAK.—Mell and Sophocles both use it for *baptidzo*. Mell is a Baptist author in Ga., and President of a college, I believe. Conant explains it by drench and "*souse*," Gale by "*laid* under."—*Wall*, 11, 75.

Once more let me explain to you the difference between *my* position and the old school of authors.

1. No one of them ever attempted a *scientific* treatment of this question. They took it up where they found it at the close of the dark ages.

2. Not one of them ever made a table of the occurrences of this word for any given space of time, not to say of its *earlier* use and that of its root, *bapto*, or of chronologic order as to its meanings, hence they all begin and *end* their citations on it from the *latest* ages of Greek, reversing every principle of science and philology. This course we repudiate.

3. Nearly all authorities claimed by the Doctor relied—those *Pedobaptists* we mean—relied on two things as settling its philology. 1st. That Proselyte Baptism by immersion, as seen in Maimonides, twelfth century after Christ, existed before and in Paul's day, and hence, (2.) that Paul alludes to it Rom. vi, 4, as an immersion. Instead of treating the question scientifically, they assume that to be a definition as Dr. Graves does. By the same course, and far more consistently, we can assume that seven authorities define it pour, the four Evangelists, the Harbinger, Peter and Christ. This is ignoring science and philology. We believe it shows how it was understood then, where they expressly call this pouring of the Spirit baptizing; but we have never called it in on treating of the philology of the word.

4. All these authorities sustain sprinkle. They hold it and pouring to have been the main modes in apostolic history. Vossius, Suicer, Witsius, Beza, all of whose works I have; all these old philologists; all copying each other with hardly a variation through centuries; all moving in each other's tracks, all hold that *baptidzo* applied to sprinklings and pourings. Take the strongest of them, Beza and Suicer, who have been quoted even as out and out immersionists. Here is Beza, whose old folio work you see in my hand, over three hundred years old—Suicer's folio, Vol. i. Also Dr. Graves' quotation from Judd, makes Beza depose thus: "Beza, after stating that *baptidzo* properly means to immerse, and never to wash, except as a consequence of immersion [he says no such thing]

says, *Nec alia est*, etc., nor does the signification of *amad*, which the Syrians use for baptize differ at all from this.—See Beza's *Armat.* in Marc. 7, 4, etc."

Here is a gross perversion and misstatement of the language and meaning of Beza both. As to his words:

1. Beza's words are, "Neither indeed does *baptidzein* signify to wash except by consequence. For properly it is to immerse," and refers to Plutarch, etc., and refers to Matthew iii, 11, for his fuller statement, where Judd alone finds his statement on *amad* not here. There Beza says: "But *baptidzein* means to wet, moisten, to plunge." Then he says:—"Neither is there any other meaning to *amad*, etc." He then says it answers to *tabhal* rather than *rachats*, that is primarily. Yet he renders it *lavo*, wash, in a number of places. This, then, is Beza's meaning:

1. *baptidzo*, in classic usage, is to moisten, plunge. Its root, *bapto*, to dye, immersing.
2. It means to wash, therefore, as a consequence. But,
3. It then came to apply to washings by pouring, etc.

PROOF.

On Acts i, 5, "John indeed baptized with water," etc., Beza says: "there is a double antithesis, when, from the one [Father] emanated the Holy Spirit, the other [this antithesis] IS OF THE WATER POURED BY JOHN and of the Holy Spirit falling upon the apostles, which mission of the Holy Spirit, and POURING [of the water] is called *baptism*." This shows what Beza meant. He refers to Acts x, and other places where the same practice was followed.

WOLFIIUS.—The great John A. Wolfius, curae Philo. et crit. 35 Ed., 1739, Vol. 1. p. 658 in Luk. xi. 38, says:

"And this is one place in the New Testament where the verb (*baptidzo*) means washing, done by sprinkling—*aspersione factam*." To this agrees Deylingius.

SUICER* is held by eminent scholars as the ablest and most valuable lexicon [Thesaurus] ever written for the interpreta-

* Thesaurus Eccles. E. Pat. Graecis, 2 vols. folio, 1728.

tion of New Testament words. So thinks Dr. Smith. He is always quoted for immersion by immersionists. After telling us the ancient lexicons, Glosses, etc., define *bapto* to moisten, wet, he giving it immerse, etc., he thus defines *baptidzo*. "It is more than to swim—less than immerse"—i. e., *dunai*—sink] which, he thinks always has the effect [*dunai*] of sending to the bottom.† Then: "But because anything is accustomed to be plunged in water that it may be washed or cleansed; hence it occurs as *tabal* in the Hebrew, which the LXX translate *baptidzo* 2. Kings, v. 14, and is taken for *rachats*, which is to wash. By metathesis to *baptidzein* is, used for the same [*lavare*—wash,] in Greek, as Judith xii. 8, [7 Sarihc.] xxxiv. 30; Luke xi, 38. "Then B. 2, p. 633, he says, showing his idea of [*lavare*] wash, "the thing signified is represented by immersion or sprinkling."‡

H. WIRSIUS.—De Ocoen. Foederum Dei, 1685: He admits John and the disciples practiced immersion in John's day, ordinarily. He says *bapto* and *baptidzo* mean to sink, moisten or dip, yet (continues he), it is not to be supposed that immersion is thus necessary to baptism, since it may be accomplished by pouring or sprinkling—(*ut perfusione vel aspersione rite peragi non possit*—as if it could not be performed by perfusion or sprinkling,) p. 672. He then urges that the 3000 on Pentecost, Cornelius, etc., were all baptized, "were perfused or sprinkled with the water—*aqua perfusos vel adpersos, quam mersos esse.*" While he grants "*baptidzo* properly [classically] means to sink, yet it is used more generally for every kind of purification.

LIGHTFOOT.—"The word, therefore, *baptismous*, applied to all these (people, brazen vessels, beds, etc., Mark vii, 4,) properly and strictly is not to be taken of dipping or plunging [*italics his*], but, in respect of some things, of washing only, and in respect of others, of SPRINKLING only."—*Hores Heb. et Tal.* ii, 419.

WESLEY'S Notes, Mark vii, 4.—"The Greek word (*baptismous*) means indifferently either washing or sprinkling." He thinks all those baptized by John were by affusion. See on Matt. iii, 6, and that Heb. x, 22, alluded to ancient manner of baptizing by sprinkling. See on Col. ii, 12.

A. CLARKE.—"Were the people dipped or sprinkled? for it is certain *bapto* and *baptidzo* mean both." On Matt. iii, 6.

†See Vol. 1, folio. Vossius' views we exposed, where Drs. Conant, Carson, etc., utterly crush this conceit.

‡Quae per immersionem aut aspersionem.

LATER CRITICS FOR THE LEARNED.

STIER.—“*Baptidzo* occurs frequently in the sense of mete washing.” He supposes at times they may have been dipped, when otherwise it would be by sprinkling, as probably on the day of Pentecost. *Leben Jesu*, viii. 303, note.

Now here you see how those old philologists talked. We put in Stier as a living and great commentator of Germany in the present age, second to none.

OLSHAUSEN has the same in substance. BAUMGARTEN, THOLUCK, EBRARD, FAIRBAIRN, ALFORD, all, and many others, too numerous to name, of the greatest scholars of the present age, all support this.

Now the point where we differ is, these old philologists knew they all held that *baptidzo* applied to affusions. They saw that. They saw it was the popular mode in Apostolic times. The point is, they accounted for the philosophy of the word's meaning from the old empirical standpoint, we go solely by the scientific method. We hope we are now well understood. We have shown the age of the Syriac version; did in our last reply. Those facts stand in the record, and will never be met. Let Dr. Graves answer Dr. Graves and Dr. Judd, Walton, Davidson, Giles, etc., etc., as well as the whole voice and testimony of the Syriac church.

If the sacred writers had desired to say dip, a thorough dip, they had two words, *eupto*, *kolumbao*. If immerse, they had, *buthidzo*, *pontidzo*, *enduo*, *katabontidzo*, *kataduno*; out of these it was easy to select. Yet never do they use them. The immersion, dark age Greeks used several of those words often, over and again when they wished to say immerse. Again we have the old canon, sprinkle, “scatter in drops” theory. Well that is the best he can do to keep afloat. I ought not to complain. We have seen that Moses sprinkled the book, the tabernacle, the people. David prayed, in Greek, Latin and Syriac (Ps. xli, 9), it reads: “Sprinkle me.” Solomon: “I have sprinkled my bed with myrrh,” perfumed in James. Herodotus says the priests commanded the people *rantidzeim*, to sprinkle themselves.” Pindar often, as all Greeks, uses it the same way—but no, says Dr. G. it is not so, his theory requires that

lame crutch. Philology, lexicons, authorities, classics, versions, fathers, ALL, ALL desert him—his only support is crazy Ewing and this crotchet. Why verbs compounded, *perfundo*, *conspargo*, take a direct accusative, perfuse, and mean to stain, bespatter, spot, &c., and defile. The good Doctor thinks we were in a blunder, at least as to Wesley. No, no, we made no blunder, not at all. No mistake yet. Now sir, we appeal to this audience, to our immersion friends, what have they to stand upon? You see we have all the facts, all the authorities, all science and the Bible with us, what can you do?—[*Time out.*

DR. GRAVES' ELEVENTH SPEECH.

Argument From the Earliest Greek Fathers.

MR. PRESIDENT:—I will now return to my argument from the Greek Fathers.

Cyril, bishop (pastor) of Jerusalem, born after Christ 315, says:

Instruction III. On Baptism, xii. "For as Jesus, assuming the sins of the world, died, that having slain sin he might raise thee up in righteousness; so also thou, going down into the water, and in a manner buried in the waters as he in the rock, art raised again, walking in newness of life."

The same writer, Initiation II. On the Ceremonies of Baptism. "O strange and wonderful transaction! Not truly did we die, nor were we truly buried, nor truly crucified did we rise again; but the imitation was in a similitude, while the salvation was in truth. Christ was really crucified, and really was buried, and truly rose again; and all these things have been graciously imparted to us, that sharing his sufferings in imitation, we might in truth obtain salvation."

The same writer, Initiation V. 4, "After these things, ye were led by the hand to the sacred font of the divine immersion (baptism), as Christ from the cross to the prepared tomb. And each was asked, if he believes in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. And ye professed the saving profession, and sank down thrice into the water, and again came up. And there, by a symbol, shadowing forth the burial of Christ," etc.

The same writer, Instruction VIII, On the Holy Spirit II. 14. "For the Lord saith: 'Ye shall be immersed (baptized) in the Holy Spirit not many days after this.' Not in part the grace; but all sufficing the power! For as he who sinks down in the water and is immersed (baptized) is surrounded on all sides by the waters, so also they were completely immersed (baptized) by the Spirit."

Though the word *baptidzo* is not here used in these examples, the act of baptism is unmistakably declared by another term, and this helps us to understand how these Fathers understood those passages we have commented upon, "buried with him in baptism," and "the baptism in the Spirit."

Basil, the Great, born three hundred and thirty years after Christ, says:

On the Holy Spirit, ch. XV. 35. "Imitating the burial of Christ by the

immersion (baptism) for the bodies of those immersed (baptized) are as it were buried in the water."

Now, substitute either sprinkling or pouring for *baptismatos* here and see if it makes sense. "Imitating the burial of Christ *by the sprinkling, by the pouring!*" Read on. "For the bodies of those *sprinkled, poured* (which you cannot do) are as it were *en thaptetai too hudati* [buried, sepulchred] in the water." Immersion alone will satisfy the sense, and, therefore, it is the literal meaning of *baptidzo*.

The same writer, in the same passage, a few lines below.

"The water presents the image of death, receiving the body as in a tomb."

The same writer, On Baptism, book I. ch. 1, 4, "Which we seem to have covenanted by the immersion (baptism) in water, professing to have been crucified with, to have died with, to have been buried with, and so forth, as it is written."

All can see what the early Fathers understood the design of baptism to be, viz., a *profession* on the part of the subject that he *had been crucified* with Christ, died with Christ, buried and risen with him to a new life; and so they imitate these acts in their baptism.

Chrysostom, born A. D. 349, says:

Comment on I Cor. Discourse XL, I. "For to be immersed (baptized) and to sink down, then to emerge, is a symbol of the descent into the under-world, and of the ascent from thence. Therefore Paul calls the immersion (baptism) the tomb, saying: "We were buried, therefore, with him by the immersion (baptism) into death."

The same writer, On the Gospel of John, Discourse XXV. "Divine symbols are therein celebrated, burial and deadness, and resurrection and life. And all these take place together; for when we sink down in the waters as in a kind of tomb, the new man comes up again."

No one can mistake the meaning of these Greek Fathers touching the design of Christian baptism or their use of the verb *baptidzo*. They never used it in the sense of "to sprinkle," or "to pour," never. Let my opponent produce *one* instance, just *one*.

Testimony of the Latin Fathers.

Tertullian, who was born about fifty years after the death of John; thus speaks of the *act* which determines what they understood the meaning of *baptidzo* to be.

Tertullian, On the Resurrection of the Body, chapter 47 Quoting Rom. vi, 3, says:

"An ignoratis quod quicumque in Christum Jesum tincti sumus, in mortem ejus tincti sumus?"

"Know ye not that so many of us as were immersed into Christ Jesus, were immersed into his death?"

I wish you all to notice in what sense Tertullian, as did all the ecclesiastical fathers, used the Latin verb *tingo*, when alluding to baptism, and as *they* used it, all lexicons, when defining *baptidzo* by *tingo*, mean the selfsame thing, "*to immerse*," "*to dip*." You will see that Elder Ditzler will translate it to "*sprinkle*" to make out his case. Anciently, and when referring to the Christian rite, it never means "*sprinkle*," as each one can see from the passages in which it stands; it corresponds with the Greek verb *bapto*, which primarily always means "*to dip*," secondarily, "*to dye*," since dyeing was done by dipping.

The same writer, a few lines below:

"Per simulacrum enim morimur in baptisate, sed per veritatem resurgimus in carne, sicut et Christus."

"For by an image we die in baptism, but we truly rise in the flesh, as did also Christ."

The same writer, against Praxeas, chapter 26. Speaking of the Savior's command, in Mat. xxviii. 19, he says:

"Et novissime mandans ut tingerent in Patrem et Filium et Spiritum sanctum."

"And last of all, commanding that they should immerse into the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit."

The same writer, On the Soldier's Crown, chapter 3.

"Dehinc ter mergitatur, amplius aliquid respondente quam Dominus in evangelio determinavit."

"Then we are three times immersed, answering somewhat more than the Lord prescribed in the gospel."

Mark here, that while Tertullian admits they had commenced to use THREE immersions, he himself declares *that it is without Scriptural authority*; and he is the first one who mentions trine immersion.

The same writer, On Public Shows, chapter 4.

"Cum aquam ingressi christianam fidem in legis suae verba profitemur."

"When, entering into the water, we profess the Christian faith, in words of his own law."

All will see that they not only *entered into* the water, but in this age all were required to profess their personal faith in Christ.

Ambrose was born about 300 years after Christ, and he thus alludes to the act of baptism :

Ambrose, *On the Sacraments*, book ii. chapter 7.

"Interrogatus es: Credisne in Deum Patrem omnipotentem? Dixisti, Credo; et mersisti, hoc est, sepultus es."

"Thou wast asked: Dost thou believe in God the Father almighty? Thou saidst, I believe; and thou didst sink down, that is, wast buried."

The same Work, book iii. chapter i. 1.

"Hesterno die de fonte disputavimus, cujus species veluti quaedam sepulchri forma est; in quem credentes in Patrem et Filium et Spiritum sanctum, recipimur et demergimur et surgimus, hoc est, resuscitamur."

"Yesterday we discoursed respecting the font, whose appearance is, as it were, a form of sepulchre; into which, believing in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, we are received and submerged, and rise, that is, are restored to life."

The same Work, book iii. chapter i, 2.

"Ergo resurrectio quid est, nisi quando de morte ad vitam resurgimus? Sic ergo et in baptismo, quoniam similitudo mortis est, sine dubio dum mergis et resurgis, similitudo fit resurrectionis."

"What then is a resurrection, except when we rise again from death to life? So, then, also in baptism, since there is a similitude of death, without doubt, whilst thou dost sink down and rise again, there is a similitude of the resurrection."

Jerome, born A. D., 331 says, in his Comment. on the Epistle to the Ephesians, book ii. chapter 4, on chapter iv. 5 :

"Et ter mergimur, ut Trinitatis unum appareat sacramentum."

"And thrice we are immersed, that there may appear one sacrament of the Trinity."

Alcuin, born A. D., 735, to the brethren at Lyons, in epistle xc. speaking of the Christian rite of baptism, he says :

"Ut vero cognoscatis hujus sacratissimi mysterii significatione, juxta sanctorum Patrum intelligentiam et statuta ecclesiastica, vestrae charitati eadem sacramenta catholica interpretatione ostendam."

"That you may know the things signified by this most sacred mystery, according to the understanding of the holy fathers and the statutes of the church, I will show to your love the same sacraments, with the catholic interpretation."

After a full description and explanation of the preliminary ceremonies, he adds :

"Et sic in nomine sanctae Trinitatis trina submersione baptizatur."

"And so, in the name of the holy Trinity, he is baptized with a trine submersion."

All can see that no other act than immersion will answer the design of baptism as observed by the church for the first eight centuries after Christ.

No candid man can question how the church usually understood the term *baptidzo* in the commission; as did the Greeks, so the Latins; all understood it to denote an immersion, or its equivalent.

Replication.

A few little things first before I forget them :

1. If it was indeed true, which he takes so much time to assert, and closes each speech with—*i. e.*, “that all the facts, all the authorities, all science, and the Bible, are with him;” if this were true, would he not, at least, deign to bring some of them forward? I intreat him to state one, just one, under each head. I want something definite, tangible to reply to—this striking at thin air is tiresome. Bring forward just one passage in the New Testament referring to baptism in which there is a word that the Greeks ever used in the signification of to sprinkle—the primary meaning of which is given, to sprinkle, in any Greek lexicon. This would be a delightful fact for his brethren to contemplate. Or let him produce one standard lexicon of the Greek language that gives either to sprinkle or to pour upon as the real primary and literal meaning of *baptidzo*. That would be refreshing indeed, and a thousand times better than my friend’s bold assertions. Or, let him, now, while we are upon the subject, produce one Greek authority, in any age, who used *baptidzo* in the physical sense of to sprinkle or to pour. I doubt not that he could procure a million for the example, and be crowned with immortal glory by his friends.

If he can do none of these important things, will he produce a recognized standard authority in Germany or America who endorses the new-born philology, presented to be christened in this discussion—*i. e.*, that the first meanings given by the lexicographers of all languages are not the primary and literal—but the first definition ever given to a word in the ages of ages past is the only true primary, and is the meaning we should give the word to-day!

That Elliptically, in English, and in other languages, to sprinkle and to pour do sometimes take an indivisible noun without a preposition expressed is true, and what I have said, but I do say that when not expressed, it must be understood. Every tyro in language knows this to be a fact, so that if my opponent should produce a dozen examples, instead of his two or three examples, which forsake him on examination, they amount to nothing.

David did indeed pray, "sprinkle me," but why did he stop short? The rest is with hyssop, "a hyssop branch dipped in the water of purification, and I shall be clean." Why would he not give you the whole verse? To sprinkle an object with fluid is something quite different from sprinkling that object itself. It is also true that Herodotus says the priests commanded the people to sprinkle themselves. But why does he stop short again? Sprinkle themselves with what? Will he tell us?

There never was a command given to people on this earth to sprinkle themselves with no other qualifying or explanatory words. It is with *something*, dust, ashes or fluid. This canon is no thin conceit of mine. It confronts him at every turn, and he can find no enchantment that will prevail against it, and I care not how often he alludes to it. I wish the people of this whole land to be thoroughly impressed with it. I will unite with him in submitting the question to the Presidents, and the Professors of languages in every college in the United States, and agree to abide by their decision. I will restate my position in the form of a universal rule of all languages.

Before all nouns denoting persons or *indivisible* things, used as direct objects of the verbs, to sprinkle, to pour, etc., there must be the preposition, on or upon, expressed or understood.

He brings forward several pedobaptists to testify as partisans, rather than scholars, that they think, while it is true John, Christ and his disciples practiced immersion, yet it is not in all cases necessary, etc. But who told them it is not necessary? It is a question of fact we are settling, and these very witnesses establish that!

He so garbles the few authorities he produced in his last speech that it is impossible to determine what they do say. Wesley and A. Clarke wrote in English, why will he not quote full sentences from them?

That Witsius is not fairly presented is evident from the few words of Latin Elder D. submits. For aught I know Witsius says, and he certainly is more likely to have said, after affirming as he does, that *bapto* and *baptidzo* mean to dip, to immerse—(I have never seen where he says to moisten) that it is not to be supposed that immersion is thus necessary to baptism, since it may be accomplished by pouring or sprinkling. Eld. D. quotes these words as implying this: “*ut perfusione vel aspersione rite peragi non possit*,” and translates it “as if it could not be performed by perfusion or sprinkling.” The Latin as it stands does not read thus, *ut* never means “as if,” but “that,” “so that.” Then it read, “so that” *rite* “with due religious observance—it cannot be performed by sprinkling or pouring!” I call for the whole paragraph in which the language is found, and unless produced will claim that Witsius says the very opposite of what my opponent represents him as saying. But again.

Eld. D. makes him say that the 3,000 were baptized—*aqua perfusos vel adspersos quam mersos esse*—is all the Latin he gives and translates it, “were perfused or sprinkled with the water,” but there is *mersos esse* which he does not pretend to translate! How are we to decide what the author does say? Suppose he does give it as his opinion that they were aspersed, it is only an opinion *at best*, and does not weaken my position after he has frankly confessed that the proper and literal meaning of *baptidzo*, is to dip, to immerse. Stuart and Anthon after stating this as scholars, yet as churchmen, they believed that sprinkling would answer. *But who told them so, when Christ commanded to immerse?*

Until Eld. Ditzler presents us with the Latin text of Witsius, I will suppose, with greater show of reason that he said, since the word *baptidzo* means only to immerse, if those in the day of Pentecost were baptized by affusion—they must

have been so copiously over poured or besprinkled with water, as to have been *immersed* in it.

I will give the fuller testimony of these witnesses in my argument from the admission of learned Pedobaptists, when we shall see what Beza, and Wolfius and Suicer do say.

I will now give a few minutes to reviewing his constructions of the examples from Greek authors, to prove two things.

1. That *baptidzo* when used in its physical sense, by which I mean its literal, as opposed to its figurative, means only to dip, to immerse, overwhelm.

2. That his repeated assertion that "in every instance in classic Greek where *baptidzo* puts a living being under water—clear under—it destroys." I will notice his statements in the order I have noted them.

1. He intimates that Dr. Conant has not given every instance of the use of *baptidzo* in Greek authors—omitting those that were against his case. Now I suggest that the bare assertion of my opponent is not quite sufficient to impeach so honorable a scholar as Dr. Conant. There is not a Christian scholar in either hemisphere but that respects Dr. Conant, and believes him above deceit or trickery—

If my opponent has found any not discovered by Dr. Conant and all scholars before his day, he would be profoundly thankful to Elder Ditzler to cite them, giving the work, chapter and page, where the example can be found, and this is the time and place where Elder Ditzler should have presented the quotations of the text in full, and his translation. His assertions and a few disconnected words and disjointed sentences, will not pass—I will wait for them.

2. I did not cite the example he mentions, at all; he indulges his fancy when he tells you what I said about this Ex.; but this case is a clear case of immersion, if he would only give it to you in full—"the ship being immersed by the waves,"—*submerged*, immersed—"became filled with sea water, and confusion," etc.,—and let him give the full text of the examples.

You will observe, he takes no notice of my first example from Aristotle, where the land at ebb tide was not immersed, however much it was sprinkled by the spray of the sea, but at flood tide it was immersed—overflowed—buried under the water.

Nor does he notice my second, third, fourth or fifth—first five examples unnoticed! He does notice my seventh (Conant's 22.) by simply impeaching the translation of Conant—declaring it “false” and “most outrageous.”

Now will every scholar and school-boy even decide between the fidelity and scholarship of the accused and the accuser. As this is a serious charge, that will be perpetuated so long as this discussion is read, I propose to examine it, and therefore give the full text:

The same writer, Jewish War, book III, ch. 10, 9. He says of the Jews, in describing their contest with the Roman soldiers on the sea of Galilee:

“And when they ventured to come near, they suffered harm before they could inflict any, and WERE SUBMERGED (BAPTIZED) along with their vessels; *toon de baptisthentoon tous ananeuontas e belos ephthanen e schedia katelambane*; and those of the SUBMERGED (BAPTIZED) who raised their heads, either a missile reached or a vessel overtook.”

Now, Elder D. very learnedly and critically informs us that “*tous ananeuontas* is a participle, [and he might have said in the indicative action and present tense,] and should be rendered their heads being elevated;” but Dr. Conant was so ignorant as to render it as if it was an active verb, indicative mood, and exclaims “most outrageous!” Now, every tyro in Greek, and every schoolboy in this house who has committed the rules of his elementary grammar, should know how to translate participles, preceded by the definite article. I have had no opportunity to refer to a Greek grammar, but will venture to quote from memory, from the rule for rendering such phrases. “The definite article, before a participle, should be translated as a relative pronoun, and the participle should be rendered as a verb in the indicative of its own tense.”

Conant has precisely so rendered it. Mark it: “And those of the submerged *tous* who—*ananenoutas*—*raised their heads*”—literally, *swim to the top*. Elder Ditzler, of course, never met with this rule, and really did not know how it should be

rendered. This is the kindest construction that can be placed upon his statement; but his boldness and recklessness in questioning the correctness of such a scholar as Dr. Conant is what appalls me. We pass this most disastrous attempt at a simple Greek criticism, to avoid the force of this clear example, with this conclusion, that Elder D.'s mere assertions, however often or loudly made, no more than his translations, can be safely relied upon without careful examination.

In this example, then, *baptidzo* did put the soldiers "clean under the water," with their vessels, and those swimming or rising to the surface, were so alive that it was necessary to dispatch them with weapons.

Strange to say, Elder D. says I introduced Ex. 25 and 39 of Conant, cases which I never mentioned. He is repeating his debate with Mr. Wilkes I expect—he is not debating with me.

He says I introduced example 63; he is again firing from some of his old notes at Mr. Wilkes or Brentz, and talking wisely about the old iron age of Greek, as if that had anything to do with this question, and charging again that two Baptists, Conant and Bonfrer have made a verse and falsely attribute it to Josephus. All this may appear wonderful to his brethren, but scholars will have their own opinion of the modesty of the charge.

Touching the Example 70 in Conant, he evidently yields. He does not translate *baptidzo* at all, giving only the transferred word *baptidzo*, and incorrectly renders it *espergo*, with milk, perverting the manifest meaning of the passage.

Example 71. He meets with the simple assertion that smiths are never wont to cool red-hot iron by plunging it into a bath or tub of water, but always cool the hot iron by sprinkling water upon it. I will refer this learned criticism to blacksmiths everywhere.

I know how the Latin smiths cooled their hot iron—our metals. I remember Virgil describes the Cyclops forging arms—

"*Alii stridentia tinguant cera lacu.*"

Others plunge the hissing brass in the lake. Will he translate this, sprinkled the hissing brass with the lake? Will he?

The ancient mode of cooling red hot metal is established.

He meets Example 86, with Dr. Conant's note, but what matters the date or the author, the force of *baptidzo* is manifestly to immerse, to dip.

My opponent, by the time he reached the 86 Example, evidently became so confused, that he could not, with the book, the text, and translation before him, distinguish between the tail and toe!

Conant neither says that the fox's *toe* was dipped in oil, nor that his *tail* was dipped in oil, and he exhausts his remaining strength, by explaining to us that the oil was poured upon the fox's tail, and not the tail dipped into the oil! This is rather more than I can stand; you must excuse me for smiling. He will probably recover his ideas, and return to this, and all my examples in his next speech, so I will not press him further now.—*Time out.*

DR. DITZLER'S ELEVENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—As to the language of the Peshito, it is *Syriac*. It was the vernacular of Christ, and of his Apostles. The proofs of that are so abundant it would swell into a large volume. Dr. Graves says the Syriac church did not have a version [so early] because they had *Greek*! Why was not *Peter detected* by Jews of his *Galilean* dialect, which notoriously pronounced certain Aramaean or Syriac letters so different from the Jerusalem manner, just as Englishmen from Durham differ from Londoners, Yankees from Virginians in many words, that the Jews had many anecdotes on it, as Lightfoot shows us. Horne and others also give us examples. Did not Josephus have to study Greek, and *never did* master its pronunciation because he began so late, and he so commanding a scholar? All the words in the New Testament preserved to us as used by Christ are of the Aramaean dialect or Syriac. Josephus tells how unpopular it was for any Jew to study Greek. All history agrees that Matthew was *originally* composed in what they called Hebrew, that is, a dialect of the Syriac. As for Alford, he *did* hold that it was in Syriac, but changed his opinion as he tells us. He may change back again yet.

Martini, Francius, Ludovicus, Walton, and hosts of the greatest scholars and critics known, hold that what was *written in Greek was at the same time thought in Syriac*. Palfrey says the Peshito presents our Savior's discourses "essentially in the language in which they were originally pronounced." Francius: "Christ spoke and discussed in the Syriac language." Walton: "Whose vernacular language was Syriac." "Ludovicus, (author of a Syriac Lex., &c.) affirms that the *true import* of the phraseology of the New Testament can scarcely be learned, except from the Syriac." Walton: "They conceived (says he) in Syriac that which they wrote in Greek." President Stiles, of Yale, says: "The greatest part of the New

Testament was originally written in Syriac, and not merely *translated in the Apostolic age*." With him the Syriac Peshito is "of the same authority as the Greek." So we could continue the list of the greatest of names for this old Apostolic work. It is only partisans, who, when it was supposed to favor *their* views, put it up in the Apostolic age, but now wish to run it as far off as possible, because so crushing, so disastrous to their cause—only *those* now wish to cry out and tone down the value of the purest version by common consent that ever was made. People will know how to estimate that.

I told you at the start the word for the baptism of the Savior was *brecho*. To be sure it is. But when *brecho*, such a *gentle sprinkle* as *that* is translated *baptize* by the *Apostolic* Christians, and *baptidzo* (*tabhal*) in Hebrew is translated sprinkle;—I say when *they* translate sprinkle baptize and baptize, sprinkle, does it not utterly crush our opponent? The feeble the sprinkle the better for our side; for then it will meet those silly ministers, whom Wall so denounces, who put *so little* water on an infant's head. As for me, I always *pour* it on.

Origen does not use *baptidzo* metaphorically. It is a plain, simple case. Four pitchers of water were poured on the altar and the wood. It was repeated three times. No such thing as a barrel existed then. The Hebrew word never means barrel. Every lexicon on earth, every version on earth renders it either pitcher or water-bucket. There was no *overwhelm* about it. If it was, it was no *dip*, no *plunge*, no *immersion*. Where is the *dip* here? But it was a plain, simple baptism. Four pitchers of water were poured on. Origen and Basil use the word *baptidzo*, baptize, where the Bible uses the word, poured on the water on the altar, &c.

There is no getting around these facts. Both allude to the water as poured on. Basil names it pointedly. Hence there was no metaphor, it was baptism with water, the water poured on. They were Greeks; they called it baptizing.

But the Doctor comes back feebly on *perfuncto*, a compound. Now, the point *there* is decidedly against the Doctor; for *this* word now takes even an accusative, terminates or acts directly

on the object even—hence perfuse. It is used at times for wash in Ovid e. g., and for stain, “bathe,” “wash,” which meaning shows it terminates often, as *baptidzo*, on the object. When he brings the proof that Agamemnon actually dipped himself clear under the water, immersed himself, we will notice it further. He adduces no proof as yet, and on him lies that burden.

The party breathed like one baptized. Why, does he not know that water thrown suddenly on one often quite takes the breath? Again, if by baptized you mean *immersed*, no one can breathe who is immersed in your sense, totally under, sunk, unless he had a diving-bell. Who can breathe when immersed?

You imply, has been immersed. It may allude simply to one standing immersed in water up to the waist, but surely no one immersed breathes, that is immersed clear under.

The Doctor gets wonderfully confused over Julianus, the learned father of the 4th century. I wonder not at this. The quotation is here in Beza, or Matt. iii, 6, 11. But Dr. G. thinks *perfundo* is to pour all over, or something of the kind. That would not help his cause. To pour water all over a man is not dip, immerse. But he is simply defining *baptidzo*. That is the point. “It means to sprinkle,” says Julianus. No father denied it. *Perfundo* is the first word by which Stephanus, Schleusner, Stokius, Schrevellius, &c., define *raino*, the main Greek for sprinkle. It is oftener used for sprinkle by lexicographers and Fathers than *adspergo* or *conspargo*. But Tertullian used it. He uses *adspergo* a number of times in *De Baptismo* when treating of baptism, as well as *mergo* once, and *tingo* often. In *De Anima* cap. 51, he uses *mergo*, *tingo*, *perfundo*.

The very men who use this term when they wish to say pour, use *fudit*, pour forth or pour upon, *profundo*, and when copiousness is desired, they qualify by *largeter* or *copiose*. Thus do Schleusner, Stokius, Schaetgennius, &c. Our battlements all stand yet, while the last ditch has been lost by the Doctor. But he insists the Eastern Church all baptize by dipping. That is a mistake.

1. It is not proof that it is the Bible mode were that so.
2. They all use *three* dips when they dip at all, showing superstition, not Scripture.
3. It is not true as abundant testimony by various men traveling there to the contrary has been repeatedly published of late years. Gazes is a native Greek, lived and died at Athens, translated and studied in Europe, and his large lexicon, (3 vol.) gives not only *louo*, *brecho*, but *epicuno*, pour upon. He wrote in modern Greek on ancient Greek. So Kouma, native Greek, in his lexicon, gives "besprinkle" for *baptidzo*.

We will now present some facts on the Eastern church and test what they believe.

While we freely admit that the fathers immersed with a trine immersion, several facts must not be forgotten.

1st. The very first time immersion appears in patristic literature, it is trine immersion, and always required "three immersions" "to accomplish the mystery of baptism." It was thus admitted one immersion was not baptism.

2nd. The moment immersion appears in history it is admitted not to be by divine authority.*

After this as well as in Tertullian, they gave the most revolting and superstitious reasons for immersion, in that they claim a Divine and medical virtue for the baptismal water; that the Spirit of God hovering over the water, had impregnated it with a Divine power, with sanctifying grace, and hence the propriety of being touched on all parts by the grace-imparting water. Hence, the *mode* as yet, had no claim, the importance of being washed all over, became a matter of great importance, and immersion being a more certain way of accomplishing this, it became the popular mode. This was fully expressed in a later day by Theophylact also—"he who simply receives the water [by affusion] is not wholly wetted [water, sprinkle, *hugrainomenon*] on all places," (Conant, 110, Lou. Debate, 569). Tertullian says: "All

* *Ter mergitatur, amplius, a liquid, respondentibus quam Donatus in evangelio determinavit.* Three times immersed answering somewhat more than the Lord commanded, &c. See Conant, 117, Lou. Deb, 459.

waters therefore, * * do, after invocation of God, attain the sacramental power of sanctification. * * They imbibe, at the same time, the power of sanctifying," (De Bap. vol. 1, 232). Cyril: "If one desires to know why, through water * * the grace is given, let him take up the Divine Scriptures. * * For water is a great thing and the noblest of the four elements." John, of Damascus: "For from the beginning the Spirit moved upon the waters; and of old the Scripture testifies to water, that it is cleansing," (Conant, 125, 126).

Yet, with all Tertullian's superstition, he fully and explicitly admits the validity of aspersion or perfusion as baptism, and puts it in evidence that the church did, not discussing the subject, however, for it never was discussed in early days, the false statements about Novatian to the contrary, notwithstanding. The question was raised about the baptism of the Apostles—when and where were they baptized? Let us now hear Tertullian.

TERTULLIAN.

1. He says that "what we have to labor for is, that it may be granted to us to attain that blessing; for who will grant to you, a man of so faithless repentance, one single sprinkling of the water whatever?"*

Again: "Others make the suggestion, forced enough clearly, that the Apostles then served the term of baptism when, in their little ship, they were sprinkled (*adspersti*) with the waves; that Peter also was (*satis mersum*) mersed enough he walked on the sea. It is, however, as I think, one thing when to be sprinkled [*adspergi*] as were the eleven, or *intercepted* by the violence of the sea [as was Peter]; another thing to be baptized in obedience to the discipline of religion. * * Now, whether they were baptized in any manner whatever, or whether they continued to be unwashed to the end, &c."† Here note:

1. He fully grants different ways or modes of baptizing.
2. That had the Apostles voluntarily received the sprinkling of the spray upon them, it would have been baptism.
3. This sprinkling was a ceremonial washing [*lavo*].

*De Pœniten, c. vi.

† De Bap. c. 12.

4. The first quotation shows that they often baptized by sprinkling.

5. He uses *adspergo*, sprinkle, as being as complete a baptism as *mergo*.

6. In *De Anima*, he uses *mersit* for baptizing and “perfudit” *illi quos Menander ipse perfudit*, cap. 51, those whom Menander himself sprinkled.

As to *amad* and how the Syrians baptized, we read in an ancient council of the Syriac Church that the gender of the word was discussed, what form, as Semitic tongues have gender for verbs, and they say “When he baptizes, even with the invocation of the holy Trinity, and with the ablution of natural water, immersion or sprinkling, it is not true baptism,” “unless the proper word is used also.” [*Bibliotheca Orientalis*, Romæ, 1719, tom. iv. p. 50]. Again, “If when he baptizes he uses [that form of *amad*] for the present imperative, * * * immersion in natural water, washing or sprinkling, &c.,” *ibid.*

AMAD.

We have an account in the earliest Syriac literature of Simeon Barsaboe, Bishop of Sileucia and Ctesiphon. “He was surnamed *Bar Tsaboe*, the Baptist; * * and indeed he baptized his garments [*tseva*] with the blood of his life.”* Here a martyr, put to death, his own blood baptizes his body and garments, and he is called the Baptist therefrom.

Again we read in ancient Syriac literature that they retail and record, and believed that “when Christ, the Lord, was baptized in Jordan, say Simon the prophet and John Zugbi, John the Baptist filled a little vessel with water that flowed from his sacred body, and preserved it until the day he was beheaded, when he delivered it into the custody of his disciple, John the Evangelist. To this same John they add, when Christ instituted the eucharistic supper, and distributed a part to each of the Apostles, he gave a double portion, the rest of which he took and delivered in the same way as the other, in

* *Biblioth. Orient*, 1, 2, *bhadhmo*, etc., Lat, ipse uero animæ suæ vestes proprio cruore tinxit. By-the-way, does *tinxit* here mean what Dr. G. insists it does?

a little water vessel. And, afterward, he poured into this same vessel the water which flowed from the side when hanging on the cross, * * * that was the leaven of baptism, for the Apostles divided this water, which they were to use as an element in administering baptism.”†

Here, of course we know this to be a fiction, a tradition. But,

1. It shows what they believed in the mode of baptism, viz: that Christ was baptized in the Jordan *standing* the water poured upon him, flowing down over his body. Hence,

2. As *amad* expressed this, it could not mean properly immersion.

3. The water being divided out, carried abroad as an element with which they believed the Apostles baptized, shows the Syriac Church did not regard [*amad*] baptism as immersion.

Hence, we read again:

4. “There are seven kinds of baptism recorded. 1. The well known baptism in common with us all, that is to say, washing. 2. Legal baptism, that is, purification according to the law of Moses. 3. Baptism according to the tradition of the Elders, viz: the washing of cups, brazen vessels, couches, etc. 4. The baptism of John. 5. Baptism of Christ, etc. 6. The baptism of blood—I have a baptism to be baptized with.* 7. The baptism of tears.‡ Here the Syriac fathers, as the Greek fathers, held that.

1. The legal sprinklings for purification were baptisms.

2. That the blood shed in martyrdom baptized the person. It was therefore held that if one embraced Christ and failed of baptism, if he was put to death, his blood streaming out upon him baptized him.

3. The tears a penitent shed baptized him.

Such are the records in the literature of the old Syrian Church, aside from the versions already examined in a former speech.

† Biblioth, Orient, Assemani, tom, iv, 241-2. I omit by the dots the eucharistic references for brevity.

* Biblioth, Orient, iii, 357, *moro ve mamudhitho aith li dhemod.*

‡ *Mamuchitho dherne.*

This baptism of blood and tears and legal sprinklings for purifications we find in the early Greek Church also. Thus we read in Clement Alexandrianus, A. D. 190, repeated by Eusebius, that a backslider was overtaken by John, the Apostle, and reclaimed. "Then, trembling, he lamented bitterly, and embracing the old man (John) as he came up, attempted to plead for himself with his lamentations, as much as he was able; as if baptized a second time with his own tears."†

Chrysostom: "And as those who are baptized are washed with water, so those who are martyred are washed with (*louontai*) their own blood."

John of Damascus reckons seven baptisms, the seventh thus: "Seventh, that which is by blood and martyrdom, with which Christ himself for us was baptized."

Athanasius: "For it is proper to know that, in like manner, the fountain of tears by baptism cleanses man." Again: "Three baptisms, cleansing all sins whatever, God has bestowed on the nature of man. I speak of that of water, and again, that by the witness of our blood, and thirdly, that by tears, with which also the harlot was cleansed.*

In all these cases baptism is accomplished by tears falling on one, or by streaming over one's face even. It is effected by blood streaming from wounds in the body—all by affusion. Origen also speaks of "the baptism of blood," referring to that of Christ on the cross. So does Tertullian.

Lactantius, A. D. 325; "So likewise he might save the Gentiles by baptism, that is, by the sprinkling of the purifying water."†

Jerome, the learned translator of Hebrew and Greek into Latin in Ezekiel xxxvi, 25: "Sprinkle clear water on you," says: "So that upon those who believe and are converted from error, I might pour out the clear water of baptism."

† Eusebius' Eccles. H. B. iii, ch. 23, Latin ver. reads, *lachrymis deuno baptizatus est*.

* See the original Conant's *Baptizein*, p. 130-132.

† *Sic etiam gentes baptismo, id est, purifici roris perfusione salvaret.*

Cyril regarded the washing of Isaiah i, 16, Lev, viii, 6, 7, as baptism.

Ambrose: "To the baptized he said, concerning which [white robes of innocence] the prophet said, thou shalt sprinkle me with hyssop, and I shall be cleansed. Thou shalt wash me and I shall be whiter than snow. For he who is baptized both according to the law [sprinkled] and according to the Gospel is made clean, according to the law, because Moses, with a bunch of hyssop, sprinkled with the blood of the Lamb."†

Cyril, of Alexandria, on Is. iv, 4: "For we have been baptized not with mere water, neither indeed have we been sprinkled with the ashes of a [red] heifer for the purifying of the flesh alone, as the blessed Paul saith, but with the Holy Spirit, and with a Divine and mentally discerned fire, destroying the filth of the violence within us, etc." Ambrose baptized Theodosius, the great, on his death-bed.

Hilarius: "There are not wanting daily sick persons who are to be baptized." Geanadius, A. D. 490, said the person to be baptized was either sprinkled or dipped.§

Novatian: As this is a noted case, we give it very literally, the more so, because it has been so designedly perverted, and grossly rendered.

To him indeed, the origin, or author of his profession was Satan, who entered into and dwelt in him a long time, who being assisted by the exorcists, while attacked with an obstinate disease, and being supposed at the point of death, received it [baptism] on the bed on which he lay, being sprinkled—if indeed it be becoming to say that (*ton toiouton*) such [a wicked] person as he received it," or could receive baptism.* Notice.

† *Adaspergebat sanguine agni*, vol. 1, 356.

‡ *Vel adspargatur, vel intinhitur*.

* Eusebius Eccles. His. B. vi. ch. xliii, 401, § 15 *Recensuit* Ed. Burton, Oxonii, 1838, vol. 1, *perichutheis elaben ei gr xrae legein ton toiouton ailaephennai*.

1. No doubt is thrown on his mode of baptism. "He received it"—baptism, (*elaben*).

2. It was by sprinkling.

3. Recovering, it was never proposed to rebaptize him.

4. If baptism be immersion, how could they say he received immersion by being sprinkled on his bed?

5. Doubt is expressed as to whether we may consider it baptism if the party is not a genuine penitent, but a deceitful hypocrite, as Novatian was held to be by these parties.

6. How miserably and by what self contradictions, immersionists have rendered this passage, can be seen by looking at A. Campbell's rendering of it in his Christian baptism, on page 189, 191, and almost any immersion work.

Origen, born A. D. 185, the most learned of all the fathers in all the early ages of the Church, his ancestors contemporary with the Apostles and Christians, commenting on John i, 24, says:

"How came you to think that Elias, when he should come, would baptize?—who did not *baptize the wood upon the altar* in the days of Ahab, although it needed purification or cleansing (*deomena loutro*) in order that it might be burned when the Lord should be revealed by fire; for this was ordered to be done by the priests."

To the same effect speaks St. Basil, A. D. 310: "Elias showed the power of baptism on the altar, having consumed the victim, not by fire, but by water when the water was for the third time poured on the altar, the fire began. The Scripture hereby shows that through *baptism* he that," etc. So write several other fathers.

Now, notice, 1. It was *the wood upon the altar* Origen speaks of as being baptized. 2. He says the *priests* did the baptizing, not Elias. 3. How did the *priests* baptize the altar? The passage, 1 Kings xviii: 33, says they *poured* it on the burnt sacrifice *and on the wood.*" The water was *poured on* the wood. Origen says they *baptized* the wood *upon the altar.* Now, where is *dip*? Did they *dip the wood* into the "barrels of water?" Did they plunge the wood into the poured water? Where is the *immerse*?" But Mr. A. Campbell, following Carson, etc., suggests that twelve barrels of water *overwhelmed* the altar—submerged "*as it were*" the altar. But *where* is the *dip*, the *plunge*, the *immersed*, even if that were true, though it is utterly untrue and monstrous?

Remember now, Dr. Graves is here to prove that the baptism Christ commands is immersion. He appeals to philology,

and is so suddenly and completely overthrown that he took the nearest cut for Jordan we ever saw. He met complete overthrow.

Next, he applied to *en, eis, apo, ek*, and they all stood from under. He proved nothing. He applied to *bury* by baptism into death, but we saw death was not water—it was not water baptism at all, and bury did not necessarily imply envelopment.

Next, he fell back on *plant*, Rom. vi, 5. But we showed that “planted together,” more properly “engrafted together,” “born together” in the likeness of his death; crucifixion demonstrated it not to allude to immerse. Trees are planted, not dipped.

He then thought it was time to assail some of our positions—late in the day, to be sure, but better late than never. He assailed our lexicons, but our armor was “from the armory of God.” He failed signally and completely. He has ventured to complain of Syriac, belittle scholarship, look wise, hold up his hands, express horror, but all fails.

He dashed boldly up to the attack on classic Greek on one point or so, but went under there. He has failed in every point—failed in all.

And now, what can he do? Of course he has to say something. He is here to support a great interest. He must go ahead.

But look at our side. Lexicons all support us—Greek lexicons, Hebrew lexicons, Arabic lexicons, the dreaded Syriac lexicons—Ethiopic, Chaldee, all are with us.

Classic Greek pours a storm of grape and canister, of red-hot shot and shell into their camp. Their own authors close up egress and shut them helplessly in where the pitiless storm beats upon their exposed and uncovered ranks.

The Laver and daily Jewish baptisms come in with a terrible force and sweep the field. For *fifteen hundred years millions, billions—hundreds of millions—HUNDREDS OF BILLIONS—yea, and a TRILLION* upon them, of baptisms, ALL BY AFFUSION, under

at influence, backed by that record—John baptized with water and Christ gave the commission!—[*Time out.*]

[The following intercolloquy then took place between the debaters.]—*Reporter.*

DR. GRAVES—Will Eld. Ditzler tell me what word in Syriac answers *dip* in English?

DR. DITZLER—I will tell you in the morning.

DR. GRAVES—Why, my boy of fifteen summers could do as well as that—only give him the requisite lexicons. I wish you to answer me now.

DR. DITZLER—Well, *tamash* is sometimes used in that sense.

DR. GRAVES—Well, now, will you abide by that answer and say that *mash* would be the proper rendering of the English word *dip*?

DR. DITZLER—Well, perhaps *tseva* would come nearer in meaning to *p* than *tamash*.

DR. GRAVES—Will you say, then, that *tseva* is the full and adequate translation of *dip* into Syriac?

DR. DITZLER—Well, in point of fact I doubt whether there be any word in Syriac that answers entirely to our *dip*.

DR. GRAVES' TWELFTH SPEECH.

Argument from the Lexicons.

MR. PRESIDENT:—I commence now my argument from the lexicons. This is the first time I have come to inquire what the lexicons say. I have been trying to show you, by collating passages in which *baptidzo* occurs from the New Testament and the classics of the ancient and modern Greek authors, what is the *usus loquendi* of *baptidzo* to enable you in a good degree to exercise an independent judgment without aid from the lexicons; for it is to these sources the lexicographers refer to ascertain the meanings they give to words. Let us now see what *they* have found *baptidzo* to mean when used by the Greeks themselves.

So many have such an undue respect and reverence for lexicons, I wish to say here, that they are not an ultimate authority. Their definitions are, or should be, founded upon the use of Greek writers, else they are worthless as authorities. No lexicographer has any right to insert an *arbitrary* meaning of a term. He is not to be trusted if he inserts a solitary meaning *that he cannot justify by the use of one or more standard Greek writers*. Any man has a perfect right to go back of any Greek lexicon to the *original source*, the Greek writers themselves, as any English reader has to appeal from Webster, to Addison, Pope, Dryden or Shakspeare, for the definition of any given word. Usage is the Supreme Court of appeals, by whose decision every proposed interpretation must ultimately stand or fall. Now, while I say this, I am willing to settle this whole question by the testimony of lexicographers.

On Real Meanings, as Opposed to Figurative.

You have heard Baptist writers and speakers charged with false statements when they say, as they are wont in general terms with Dr. Robinson, President of Brown University, that

all lexicographers give "to dip," "to immerse," as the only proper signification of *baptidzo*. We all mean by this, that all give "to immerse" as the *primary, literal* meaning of *baptidzo*, and our rules say that the primary, the definition that all lexicographers place first, * *is the only real* and proper definition. We do not mean that there are no *figurative*, poetical, mere *ideal* meanings, as "buried in sleep," "immersed in wine," "in taxes," "in debt," "in care," "in tears," "in suffering," "baptized in his own blood," but we say that no secondary or figurative use of the term is the literal, physical and real definition, and therefore, whatever my opponent may say, Baptists are justified by the highest critical authorities as, Ernesti, Morus and Stuart, in assuming that to dip, to immerse, are the only *real* definitions the lexicons give to *baptidzo*, since these are the only meanings they give as the primary or literal meanings. Therefore, I wish it distinctly understood that whenever, in this discussion, I give the *primary* meanings of *baptidzo*, as laid down in the lexicons, I understand myself as giving the true, real, physical definitions of the word, and am not open to the charge of garbling or suppressing any part of the truth respecting the real definition. I will be excused for repeating here, because it is the proper place, the rule I laid down in my last speech, touching real definitions. THE FIRST DEFINITION EVER GIVEN TO A WORD IN THE AGES OF AGES PAST, IS THE ONLY TRUE PRIMARY, AND IS THE MEANING WE SHOULD GIVE THE WORD TO-DAY. In interpreting the Commission—the law of baptism—we have nothing to do with fanciful, but with the *literal, physical* definition of the term *baptidzo*.

Philology, Etc.

Now, as touching the determination of the current signification of words by the principles of philology,—and Eld. Ditzler's newly discovered principles of philology that the scholars of the past eighteen hundred and thirty years knew nothing about, until broached by the wild Furst, of Germany, and adopted by my opponent, there is, as yet, no accepted theory: it is *terra incognita*, a field unexplored by scholars.

* Stokius and Furst excepted.

*There are no settled principles of philology by which we can conclusively determine the current definition of terms by their etymology. It is true that very often the etymological is the real physical sense of a term; but then, words so drift away from this, that not a shadow of their etymological meaning remains—e. g., prevent, pre, before venio, I come; from its etymology and use, two hundred years ago, it signified to go before, to precede, but never in our day. Then it was its primary and real definition, but now its primary, to hinder and go before or precede, is not its meaning at all. Then there are many words whose radices are unknown—especially is it true of the Hebrew and Greek languages. It is owing to the fact of its being unexplored ground that men who are given to riding hobby-horses make such frequent incursions into it, and cut such fantastic tricks in it, until they break the legs of their hobbies, and then they “come down”—and subside—having been the laughing stock of standard scholars for a brief hour, they pass away and the mention of their names in after years excites only a smile—they are never referred to as authorities by sober men. Germany once had such a man, and his name was Furst. He was known as the “wild” or “crazy” critic, and the strange principles of philology you have heard from my opponent were conceived in Furst’s brain—i.e. that the primary meaning of a term is the first meaning ever given to it, or as Elder Ditzler calls it, the *historical* primary, although that meaning has ceased to be a meaning now! But what have we to with the probable *first* meaning of the term *baptidzo*. We want the *literal*, generally understood current meaning when Christ used it. It seems that every country has had, or has its “crazy” critic. Scotland, a few years ago, had one in the person of Mr. Ewing (Presbyterian). He felt it incumbent upon him to serve his church by getting the idea of immersion out of *baptidzo*. He affirmed that there was a relation between “*bapto*” and the English word “*pop*.” By the aid of his philological chemistry the *b* of *bapto* was converted into *p*, and *a* into *o*, while at the same time the *to* became sublimated; thus leaving in his critical retort, after the labored process was over, the word *pop*, and so *poptizo*, “to pop,” is the primary meaning of *baptidzo*! To such*

fanciful and puerile results does the mimetic theory of language conduct. America has its "crazy hobby-rider in the person of Dr. Dale, who can demonstrate that the real meaning of *baptidzo* invariably indicates *intus* position (to place *within*), and yet by his philological chemistry, it means only to sprinkle a few drops of water *upon* the subject! My opponent I hear has recently smashed the pretty hobby-horse of his Bro. Dale, ambitious to have the whole field to himself and his newly constructed philological pony. I affectionately forewarn him of his untimely end. He should cultivate in himself a higher ambition than to

"Shine to *delude*, and dazzle to expire."

As for the probable etymology of *baptidzo*, I have no theory. Curtius, whom Dr. Benezler informs us is one of the ablest philologists of Germany, derives *bapto* from *bathos*. If now we accept the etymology of the learned German, this becomes additional evidence that *bapto* means to dip or plunge into; for *bathos* in Greek signifies *deep*. Hence, *baptidzo*, the word used to express the Christian ordinance, being derived from *bapto*, would itself also partake of this meaning of its primitive. Accordingly, that must be regarded as a not insignificant relationship that allies *baptidzo* with a Greek word that means "deep." This etymology being accepted, another proof is furnished, in addition to all the overwhelming arguments which exist, that *baptidzo* means to *dip* or to *put deep* (*bathos*) into water.

When Luther translated the Bible into German, he rendered the Greek *baptidzo* by *taufen*. In defining this German verb which he had employed to express the baptismal act, he wrote that it is doubtless derived from the adjective *tief* (deep), because whatever is *tauf* (or baptized) is sunk deep into water. Thus, in the German language, the relation of the verb is precisely similar to that in the Greek. And it may be added that, though now in Germany, baptism is performed by affusion, and this same word *taufen* is retained to express the act, this only shows how, from unscriptural innovations, words are made to take on significations that did not originally belong to them. *Taufen* is derived from a word meaning "deep."

How in the world does pouring and sprinkling answer at all to this radical meaning? Has not the same departure from its early meaning occurred with our English word *baptize*.

As a full answer to my opponent's historical primary theory, I submit one illustration. I suppose there are lawyers here. Suppose a citizen of Carrollton should bring an action for damages against a party for *preventing* him from entering his dwelling. But the counsel for the defendant moved the court to *quash* the indictment, on the ground that the pleadings do not set forth that his client had in any form or manner trespassed on the plaintiff's rights, or even trespassed on his property. They merely set forth that the defendant *prevented* plaintiff in returning to his dwelling—that is, defendant only entered plaintiff's dwelling *before plaintiff* did, but that he did this with any evil or felonious purpose, it is not attempted to show. The counsel would then clench his argument by adding:

“May it please the court, nothing is more clear than that the very *etymology* of the term shows, as the court is too well aware to make it necessary for me to insist on the point at large, that to *prevent* a man—which is all that is alleged against my client—is to go *before him*, which defendant claims is the true “historical primary.” I therefore move that the court dismiss the action with costs.”

What do you think of such an argument as that? Why, two hundred years ago, “to go before” was the current meaning of the word “prevent,” as our version of the Bible abundantly proves.

Replication.

1. I reserve what more I have to say touching the Syriac version and cognate matters, for my argument from versions, save this remark: Suppose I should grant that Christ did speak in the Syriac or Aramaen dialect, he did not give the commission in that language, nor did the Holy Spirit select it in which to give us the New Testament. The Greek is the inspired text; the Syriac version, made centuries after Christ, is a human and a fallible one, and is not to be compared with the Divine

text, and even could he prove that the Syriac version gave sprinkle in every place where *baptidzo* is used in the Sacred text, the fact would not weaken my argument, but it would destroy the claims of the Syriac, as being a reliable version. But it is improbable that Christ spoke in Syriac, and in no instance does the Syriac translate *baptidzo* by a verb that primarily means to sprinkle.

2nd. What does he mean by saying that “the word for the baptism of the Savior is *brecho*”? Does he mean in the *Greek*? It certainly is not. Does he mean in the Syriac version? It most certainly is not. What does he mean? Christ never was physically baptized but once, in whole or in part, his feet never were baptized when his body was not—*brecho* is nowhere used for baptism in any sense.

3rd. Nor is *brecho* interchanged with *baptidzo* by any apostle or apostolic Christian. I am compelled to meet such assertions with an unqualified denial, until some shadow of proof is submitted. This is not the place for assertions, but for proofs. Let him produce *one* instance in the Greek of the Old or New Testament where *taval*, the proper Hebrew synonym of *baptidzo*, is translated by *brecho*—to sprinkle—or where *brecho* is interchanged with *taval* or *baptidzo*, or any word referring to Christian baptism. Until he does so, let him no longer affirm that “the land was *baptized* with the falling rain,” or that “David *baptized* his couch with his tears,” or “Mary the Savior’s feet.” He has no right to use the term baptize, in these instances. No land anywhere was ever baptized, no bed was ever baptized, and Mary never baptized any one!

4th. Scholars will decide, where the crushing applies—I have no concern.

5th. Origen—he is never done saying, declares that the wood (Elijah’s) altar, was immersed—overwhelmed—with water. Very well; no one disputes it; but I say he spoke figuratively, as writers do when they say, “the land was drenched—baptized—in the blood of its sons.” It matters not, with what vessel—a barrel or tub—or how the water was applied to the altar. Origen said it was immersed, a manifest *metonymy*—the effect for the act; it was as wet as if it had been immersed.

6th. But I “came back feebly on *perfuno*.” Well, it is a most feeble thing. Is not the preposition *per*, all over, “all about” in composition with *funo*—to pour out, to sprinkle—and hence does not *perfundere* mean to “overpour,” “to besprinkle”—and, of course, this and all similarly compounded verbs, denoting to divide, to scatter, can take an indivisible object without an additional preposition—it has one. Is this, the last, the best he can do with my destructive canon?

7th. He demands proof of what never before was questioned by living man, much less a scholar—*i. e.* that Agamemnon “immersed himself, dipped himself “clear under.”—Ex. 65. I find it *in the very text itself*. It cannot be “parsed”—construed with any other sense. Then I bring an authority whom Eld. D. never doubts, however often he may contradict—*i. e.* Jacob Ditzler—see Wilkes and Ditzler’s Debate—attempting to keep Judith out of the water. He says “if she had gone into the water, *eis*, with, the accusative would have been used.” Very well. In this case as in the case of the baptism of Jesus, we have *eis* with the accusative—*baptison eis limnen*—immersing himself in the lake! He therefore did go “clear under,” according to the authority of Jacob Ditzler, and then, according to the superstition that ordered the immersion, the person must go “clear under” to receive any benefit from the charmed waters of the lake.

Then I have three or four times asked him to tell you if King Agamemnon survived his immersion into the lake Copais, when on his way to the Trojan war, but he is as silent as the grave. I will tell you. He was in the ten years’ siege of Troy after that immersion, and returned to his kingdom again. Why would he not refer to this? By this example alone we can determine the classic use of *baptidzo*, that it is to immerse, and we learn how to render “*eis ton Jordanen*,” for we have here a similar phrase, “*baptizoon eis ten Kopaida limnen*,” which Stuart, a Pedobaptist, translates “*plunging into lake Copais*.” If the latter must be translated “immersing into the lake Copais” the former must be “immersed into the river Jordan.” And since he is so fond of these Greek examples, I give him another, and mark if he notices it at all.

Plutarch, who was born only fifty years after Christ, *On Superstition, III.* The superstitious man, consulting the jugglers on his frightful dreams, is told :

“Call the old Expiatrix and plunge (baptize) thyself into the sea, and spend a day sitting on the ground.”

Notice the Greek, *kai baptison seauton eis thalassan*. Here we have Eld. Ditzler’s *eis* with the accusative, and it must, therefore, mean *into* the sea, and plunging into the sea I am inclined to believe that he was immersed, dipped under the water, overwhelmed by it, but if no living being ever survived an immersion, how could the man of bad dreams spend a day sitting upon the shore after it? Eld. Ditzler will, of course, explain all this, but he’ll never take back his assertion—never! Will he read it “sprinkle thyself into,” or “with the sea?” Stuart and all critics translate this, “plunge yourself into the sea,” etc.

Now, mark well two things. We have here the very same verb and *regime* that we have in the Commission—the law of baptism—the present participial form of *baptidzo*, having the force of the imperative, and, therefore, if the sorceress did command the subject of bad dreams to immerse, and not to sprinkle or pour himself in the sea, then, as certainly did Christ command his apostles to immerse believers; and, if *eis ten thalassan* took the subject into the water of the sea, then, *eis ton Jordane* took Christ and the subjects he baptized into the waters of the Jordan. Eld. Ditzler, nor any living man can escape these conclusions.

But did you notice how he disposed of the fox case, Example 86? With the Greek text before his eyes he told you that “the man baptized the fox’s tail with oil, and, therefore, it must have been done by pouring the oil upon his tail, and not by dipping the tail into the oil.” There is certainly nothing in the Greek that intimates that the fox’s *tail* was baptized, but it says: “The man baptizing *tow* in some oil bound it to the fox’s tail and set fire to it.” There is something about the Greek that wonderfully confuses my opponent’s mind. From this and the specimens he has given us, translating Greek certainly is not his *forte*. I did not expect anything like this

from the reputed master of forty languages who never makes a mistake about facts of any sort. By no grammar of the Greek language can he translate this passage *Kai stupeion elaio baptisas*, as he has done, poured oil upon the tow; for the *tow*, not the *oil*, is the direct object of the verb, and *elaio* oil is the simple dative of element and must be translated *in oil*.

You have heard how he sought to cover his defeat here by turning this case into a ridiculous test, that this case reminded him of my sliding hold upon the tail of immersion. I did not come here to jest or to trifle, as God is my witness, but if it is pleasantry he relishes, then I submit it to this congregation if the figure he drew would not more truly represent his own very slight hold on the *tail* of the Syriac! Why, sir, I asked him last night for the verb in Syriac that he would say undoubtedly corresponded to our word "to dip," and he asked the whole night to find the word! Why, sir, my boy of sixteen could, with a lexicon in hand, find the word, only give him one whole night for it, then he gave two and took them back, and hesitatingly, finally concluded there was none "that precisely answered to it!"

Ah, sir—

"This index learning turns no student pale,
But holds the eel of Science by the tail."

Now, if he has had fun enough, I am done with it.

But *this* Example cannot be disposed of by a laugh. More things than one can be settled by this single example. I have told you that the proper rendering of the simple preposition "*en*" would, in the various passages in the New Testament settle the whole baptismal question, and so the very rule by which the phrase—*stupeion baptisas elaio* can alone be properly rendered will give us the grammatical rendering of "*baptidzo hudati, baptisei en pneumati kai puri*"—one sentence that illustrates the dative of element, with or without the preposition *en*.

Mr. President, I do not dwell upon this case to torture my opponent, but he, with the opposers of immersion, in defiance of the well known rules of grammar, persistently translates the dative of element, whether with or without the preposition *en* by, *with*, whenever it refers to the baptism of water or of the

Holy Spirit, and you witnessed the laugh he created among the four and twenty Elders on the left, and the friends of sprinkling, when he treated not as a scholar, those expressions of John the Baptist. (Luke iii, 16). "*Ego men hudati baptidzo. Autos humas baptisei en pneumati agioo kai puri.*" "*Baptidzo hudati, baptisei en pneumati kai puri.*" Does he not know, does not every school boy know, that the dative answering to the question "*wherein*," is used without the preposition, the *en* being understood? Has he not met scores, if not hundreds of instances in his Greek Testament, if he reads it? Notice these: "*Tauti to nukti*," "in that night," (Luke vii, 42.) "*Zeon too pneumati*" (the very word,) "fervent in spirit." (Acts xviii, 25.) Will Elder Ditzler say "with the night" and "with the spirit?" "*Poreaesthai hooduois autois*," "to walk in their own ways." (Acts xiv, 16.) The dative here answers to the question "*wherein*," as, following *baptidzo hudati* answers the same "in water as in the enveloping element in which the act took place." The dative is also used without the preposition, in answer to the question "*where*," or the *element* in or *within* which anything is said to be done. And if he sees fit to join issue, I will give him instances for half an hour from the classics, if he can possibly leave the Syriac long enough to attend to a thoroughly scholarly discussion. It is time for bold assertions to give way to grammatical rules. I will defend Conant, whose scholarship he is wont to depreciate, and translate this once more; "He immersed the tow in oil and bound it to the fox's tail." Stuart gives two instances to illustrate this construction of the dative of element without a preposition. "They dip the wool *themio* in warm water." "Dipped *oistois* in the gall of serpents."

He takes this profoundly critical notice of Example 30. "The party breathed like one baptized—who can breathe when immersed?" I must not say he intentionally misstates the text—it was before his eyes—I will say he makes a gross mistake as to the fact, that he palpably misquotes and perverts what the author does say. He says, "she breathed as persons breathe after having been immersed"—not one while under the water, but like one who had been a little while under it.

The case is manifestly against him, and he does see it, or he would have quoted it correctly.

I obtained from the Elder, the chapter and verse in Ezekiel, where he said the Hebrew declared the land was *baptized* by being rained upon, and what do you think I found? The Hebrew word there is *ta har*, "to cleanse," not *taval*, "to dip," nor even *rachats*, "to wash" nor any word that ever signifies or is ever, in God's word used to express "to dip," "to immerse," or any term that enters into this controversy. The Greek of the seventy gives *brechomene*, "moistened!" What right had Elder Ditzler to say the original reads "to baptize?" Will he now tell us the word in Syriac in the passage he translates baptized? I will tell him it is not "*amad*."

Touching the testimony of Julianus, let him but produce the text, and I will show that his translation and construction of it is both incorrect and misleading. Julianus never said that *perfundere* was a real or *literal* meaning of *baptidzo*—and what if he had? What he did suggest was promptly rebuked by Augustine. Nor does Schleusner, or Stokius, or Schaettgenius give *perfundere* as a real or *proper* meaning of *baptidzo*, but only to dip, to immerse. Tropical and poetical meanings are something else, and are never used in the language of law. As for my opponent's battlements, I candidly confess I have not been able to descry anything that would pass for one above ground; and if I have once been in the ditch, it was when I went after my opponent.

In my argument from lexical authorities, I will notice his statement that *tingo* means to sprinkle, and that Tertullian used it in this sense.

He denies that the Eastern or Greek Church "all," [always, or all branches of it?] baptizes by dipping; but gives no authority to support his assertion.

There is no one fact so patent in the history of that church; no one fact better known. It is simple waste of time to prove this to have been the universal practice of the Greek Church from its rise until the present time. I submit a single authority, lest here some of his brethren may be mislead by his asser-

tion, the remaining proof will be given in my argument from the practice of the Greek church.

DR. WALL.—“The Greek church in all its branches of it does still use immersion.” “All the Christians in Asia, all in Africa, and about one-third part of Europe, are of the last sort, in which third part of Europe are comprehended the Christians of Græcia, Thracia, Bulgaria, Rascia, Wallachia, Moldavia, Russia, Nigra, and so on; and even the Muscovites, who, if coldness of the country will excuse, might plead for a dispensation with the most reason of any.—*His. of Inf. Bap.*, part ii, c. ix.

When I quote the lexicons, I will give you what Gaza says of *baptidzo*. His very first meaning is, “to dip repeatedly!”

He again consumed a large portion of his time in citing examples from Dr. Conant’s “Baptizein” on the figurative uses of *baptidzo*. I again say, while it is true there are hundreds of instances of the figurative use of this as of every other word, we are not seeking for its figurative, but its physical or real signification, as used by the Savior in giving the only law for administering Christian baptism. No critic or commentator, and not even a controversialist known to me, ever claimed that *baptidzo*, as it stands in the commission, is used in a metaphorical signification. If not, then why does my opponent spend all his time in producing its figurative uses? Should I take time in noticing the examples he produces in his last speech—every one figurative, as any reader of common intelligence can see—I should justly forfeit the respect of this audience, as I am sure I would that of Elder D. He gives them with the case of Novatus to engage, if possible, my attention, and lead me away from my argument. In my argument from the testimony of the Fathers, ancient and modern scholars and historians, I will give the testimony of these very men as to the meaning of the word and the mode of baptism in their day.

As to his closing remarks, his exhortation, or “home-stretch,” as he calls it, I have only this to say. If he thinks it worthy of his scholarship, his candor, his reputation as a Christian debater, worthy of, and suited to the *taste* of his people, I suppose I ought to be satisfied, since it can injure only himself. Thinking men and Christians of all names will decide for themselves after an examination of our argu-

ments and proofs whether he is warranted in his extravagant assertions; and it will suggest itself to some that I have not yet examined a lexicon or a version, or taken the testimony of historians, of critics, commentators or Pedobaptist scholars as to the meaning and use of *baptidzo*, or the practice of the apostolic churches!! How does he know that I have nothing from all these sources to bring forward? He could, with the same propriety, have made such assertions at the close of his first speech as his last. It is doubtless one of his old stereotyped closes, used in some previous debate, and he intended to have used it at the conclusion of his last speech on this proposition, but mistakes will happen.

I here close my examination of the classic Greek authors. I have given you 21 examples, out of the hundreds given by Conant, selecting those that would answer the double purpose of disproving his assertion, and establishing the *usus loquendi* of the term *baptidzo* in classic Greek. He has not produced an example in which a scholar would render *baptidzo* by "to sprinkle" or "to pour upon." Mark that, but on the other hand, to immerse, or its equivalent, is demanded in every case denoting physical action, and all the figurative and poetic or ideal meanings given of *baptidzo*, are grounded upon the idea of immersion, overwhelm, etc.—*Time out.*

DR. DITZLER'S TWELFTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS.—The Doctor returns to *en* and brings up the dative of “*whither?*” and talks glibly of scholarship. That part will do for children. Now he asserts that *hudati* occurring without the *en*, is under the heading “wherein?” Is not that rich? The dative is here used then, not of instrumentality, as speak *with* the voice, (*phonaē*), smite *with* the sword, baptize *with* water, *with* the Spirit, *with* fire, but he makes it an answer to wherein? In *what* fire, in *what* Spirit, in *what* water? *Wherein* were ye baptized? That will do for “torture” to the King’s English and Luke’s Greek, but no torture to us. He cites “*tanti to nukti*” as a case in hand. Is the night pointed to as an instrument with which something is done, as is water, or the spirit, or fire? or is it referred to as a point of time in which or DURING which something took place? In the night, *during* the night, *on* that night even, would all answer to *that* use of the dative, but it would not do for *this* use, during, in, on the water. He cites “fervent in spirit,” *too pneumati*. Does this or the next one he cites answering he says to “wherein,” point out that the spirit is the *instrument* with or by means of which *we* are made fervent? O no, he will say. Then it is not a case in hand at all. The nicer force of the Greek, is fervent *in respect to the spirit*. That is we are to be fervent. Wherein? In what respect? Now comes in *that* use of the dative—fervent in reference to the spirit; *our* spiritual nature is fervent. But he says the dative is used “in answer to the question where?” and wants me to join issue there! Indeed! But is *that* the use of the dative anoint with oil (*en*), or sprinkle with blood (*haimati*), thousands on thousands of such examples filling up the volume of Greek the world over—is that use of it in answer to where? What *does* he mean? Did John mean in what fire? where was the fire? where the water? where the Holy Spirit in which people were to be baptized? Nothing of the kind. We have already

given examples enough on *en*—could multiply them a hundred fold. There is no proof as to the primary meaning of *en*; his assertion has no support. Nor is his count true or just. If *en* occurred 5000 times meaning *in, by, at locally*, and only 10 times meaning *with* as an *instrumentality*, it helps him not. But hundreds of times in Bible Greek *en* means *with*. We gave a number of cases.

But we have an endless contest on what is the primary—whether it is mere current use, or the first meaning the word had. We say the latter, Dr. G. the former.

Fairbairn (*Hermaneutical Manual*, p. 97,) after the very judicious remarks of §4 p, 93, gives us the best possible rule on the subject:

“In the great majority of cases, the *etymological* is also the *actual sense* of the word; and even when the acquired or metaphorical use comes materially to differ from the *primary* one, the knowledge of the *primary* is still of service, as most commonly a certain tinge or impress of it survives even in the ultimate.”

On p. 96 he dwells on the folly of “making what is the *primary* ground of our words and ideas, their ultimate standard and measure.” He contrasts “acquired or metaphorical” with the “primitive and sensational meaning”—*i. e.*, meaning known by sense, as Fowler explains: “Words thus in *current* use sometimes escape *altogether* from their *original* meaning.” Thus this great standard explicitly tells us the *current* is not the *primary* meaning.

But Jahn is a great standard also in these matters. Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 95, § 31, he says.

“Etymology, that is, *the investigation of the primary signification of words*, and of the manner in which other significations have arisen. (*Italics his*). BY THE PRIMARY SIGNIFICATION IS MEANT, THAT WHICH THE INVENTORS OF THE LANGUAGE ORIGINALLY AFFIXED TO A WORD.”

So Gesenius, Havernick, and *all* authorities treat it. It remained for my opponent to take a position so wild, so absurd, and defiant of all fact and the very meaning of the word *primary*, which means first, the first meaning the word had. And as he has never attempted to meet my arguments here, and never will, it stands in the record DEMONSTRATED, that

sprinkle is the primary meaning of *baptidzo*, and immerse is a derived, a metaphorical meaning—purely so.

CLASSIC GREEK ON BAPTIDZO.

Dr. Graves feels it to be absolutely necessary, as well he might, to come to the rescue of *dip* in *classic* Greek. In answer to my facts that *baptidzo* never means to dip, though *bapto* does at times, but not immerse, he now cites examples, 15, 16, 39, 59, 65 and 86. Well, No. 39 we already examined and found it damagingly against the learned Doctor. Let us examine the rest.

No. 15, in Conant: "The ship being submerged, (baptized), confusion seized the fleet of the barbarians."

Well, this is not dipping. The ship was sunk, went to the bottom of the sea, and there it remains yet—has for two thousand years. How would you like such a baptism? That is not dip, putting in and immediately withdrawing the object. In one case we saw confusion, and plans of leaving a baptized, but not immersed ship. No specific meaning attached in Polybius to *baptidzo*.

No. 16, in Josephus: "Continually pressing down—i. e. immersing the boy, and baptizing him, as if in play." Now what is more common in boys swimming, than to splash water in each other's face, bedash with water? We have often seen it done, often participated, where they stand and throw water on each other, till one or the other could not get breath, and would have to turn and run. We see them swim after another and with one hand throw on the other, till it becomes almost impossible to get breath in a short time. One cannot breathe when water is dashed rapidly or continuously—*aei*—*all the time*—in the face. Had they immersed him enough to cause to perish, it would have been evident malice, but they affused him with water, baptized his face so it suffocated him, as well as often pressing him down—*barountes*, immersing, *barountes* expressing that.

The next example is 59, in Conant: "But they, by themselves baptizing, and immersing, (sinking) (*baptidzomenoi kai kataduontes*) in the pools, were all useless, and many of them

also perished." How could they be immersed by *baptidzo* here, when *kataduno*, "immerse," has to come after, to immerse, them? You know it is the main Greek word in constant use for immerse, so rendered by all, and constantly, every time, rendered by the only English of immerse by Conant, "sink." This text, then, shows that *baptidzo* does not properly mean "immerse" even in the decline, the iron age of Greek.

He declares that I said the "oil was poured on the tail." I will admit I made a *lapsus*, a thing Dr. Graves is guilty of most constantly, but a rarity it is with me. I said tail for tow, I admit. But now, the tow was baptized with oil, *elaio*, dative case, no preposition. Now, which is most reasonable, that the man should pour oil on the tow, or dip the tow in the oil? Oil is often thick, tow is so light you could not immerse it into the oil unless you took a stick or something and pressed it into the oil. It was most natural and convenient, therefore, to pour the oil on the light tow and set it on fire, after binding it to the tail of the fox. It is the reverse of proving dipping. Suppose it read anointed with oil, you would say it was affusion. Dr. Graves wants solemnity now. Well, he introduced the levity, he raised the laugh, and when we turned the tables badly upon him he is opposed to it. His people thought it was nice to hear him talk as he did; we only dosed them with their own physic.

Why, really the Doctor put on such airs of manner that a friend of mine offered me his boy, who, he said, could equal Dr. G., or any one, cutting all sorts of "monkey shines," but I declined the generous offer. Dr. G. introduced the levity—the moment he desists he will find that I have no inclination that way.

Case 71, in Conant, we already showed (Reply 10), was no case of dipping. It was a mass of red-hot iron so large that smiths, (plural) were required to draw it out—so it is in the Greek—and we know such a mass of red-hot iron, with its "fiery glow," is not plunged into tubs of water by smiths for several reasons. It would ruin the iron. It would throw all the water out of the tub or trough, and considerably to the annoyance of the smiths. In such cases the water is always

sprinkled or poured on the iron. The Greek reads—baptized *with water*—"the fiery glow" quenched *with water*—twice the word *hudati*, with water, occurs. I want to hear the Doctor on the dative of instrument, here. There is no *en* involved at all.

You will all bear me out that I have never made a fling at the Doctor, with the view to discredit his scholarship. I have treated him with every mark of courtesy, as the representative of a great and able body of ministers—himself a leader of renown and distinction; all well deserved. If, however, he persists in adopting the opposite course in regard to myself, he may, perhaps, tempt me to retaliate, and if he does, I shall promptly call him to a test on languages. These matters are not pleasant. Dr. Graves asked me, just at the close of my speech, to tell him what was the Syriac word for dip. I gave him two words. I paused a moment, looking at him to read his design, for I knew he had a purpose in it, and a careless answer, or one not guarded, might be used for capital. I knew that there was no word in Syriac that meant specially to *dip* and that meant *nothing* else, and so I told Dr. Varden (sitting by the Doctor) what the two words did mean—*tamash* and *tzeva*, neither being exclusively dip, and never, in the older Syriac, implying *immerse*. Out of my pause he now seeks to make the impression that it was because I could not give it, that I did not answer at once! I gave them my Syriac Testament, (Drs. Graves and Varden), and they have had my Syriac books all night. I gave the answer, therefore, *impromptu* at his asking. Let us now proceed with the argument.

In Ezekiel xxii. 24. Now the word purify in Hebrew is here translated in the Syriac by *baptize*. In the Greek it is *brecho*, sprinkling, rain. The mode is given. It needs no lexicon. "Thou art the land that art not baptized; no, upon thee the rain has not fallen." The mode is pouring—it is baptism. In Ps. vi, 6, the Greek is *brecho*, which the Doctor insists is a very slight sprinkle; a light, gentle affusion. That is all true. But the point is, that the word meaning such a little sprinkling as he tells of, is a number of times translated (*tzeva*) *baptize* in the old Apostolic Ver-

sion of the Syriac, both in the Old and New Testament. In the second and third centuries a sect of Christians called John's Disciples, as Neander Vol. I., Judd, in Dr. Graves' Essay on M. Stuart—Appendix, and Michaelis' edition of Castell's Syriac part of his lexicon issued apart, all tell us, as well as Assemani *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, Tom. 1., they used this word altogether for baptize, as far as their writings have been found, and the *noun* form of this word is their name, and as they baptized daily, they were called *Hæmero-Baptistai*. One of them was pre-eminently dignified as "*the Baptist*," because in being put to death his blood pouring from the wound "baptized his garments," as well as himself!

Well, lexicons come up again, and Furst is attacked with renewed vigor. But till our points are met, that is useless. If we attack an author, we give reasons for it that all can appreciate. He assigns no reason, no grounds of objection against Dr. Rabbi Furst, himself an immersionist, but compelled by science and truth to give *sprinkle* as the primary meaning of *baptidzo* in Hebrew. We tell Dr. Graves that the "craze" of Furst all originated in his own brain. *He never heard a word* against him in his life save from immersion "controversialists."

But some "crazy" German has given it as his opinion that *bapto* comes from *bathos*. Indeed! Then the crazy men are not all in asylums yet, evidently. What reason, what proof, what philological fact does he give to support it? *Bapto* is the root of *baptidzo*. Now if *bapto* comes from *bathos*, they would have the same fundamental signification, and simply part company as they branched off, as *bapto* and *baptidzo* and all words of all languages do. But *bapto* and *bathos* have not a shade, not one simple shade of meaning in common, neither has *bathos* with *baptidzo*. Wash, cleanse, drunk, overflow, overwhelm, dip, "dip repeatedly," never can come from *bathos* in Greek. *Bathos* means "height," as literally as depth, "altitude"—how much immerse is in that as a primary?

Now for every point we make, we adduce the facts supporting it. Where does *bathos* mean moisten, smear, stain, dye, color, or wash? Of all "crazy men" this is the craziest.

Hence the wild folly of such guesses the more requires that we strictly adhere to scientific principles and facts.

We will now introduce more Greek witnesses. Origen, the most learned of all the Fathers, the son of a renowned martyr, who was born only eighty-four years after John's death, whose immense Greek works that survive now, make nine huge, folio volumes, comments on 1 Kings xviii. 33, where Elijah had four pitchers of water, so it reads in the Hebrew and Greek, and all ancient versions, "pitchers," "water-buckets," (*kadim*) poured on the altar, it built of stone and wood on the top of Carmel, a mountain, during the three year's drouth. This Greek calls it "baptizing the altar." "How came you to think that Elias, when he should come, would baptize, who did not baptize the wood (*ta xula*) upon the altar in the days of Ahab, though it needed cleansing, (*loutro*)," etc.

Basil, a Greek Father of the fourth century, (A. D. 310), calls it baptizing. "Elias showed the power of baptism on the altar, having consumed the victim * * * by water * * * the water * * * was for the third time poured on the altar * * * The Scriptures hereby show that through baptism he that," etc. He "baptized the wood," "poured water on the wood." "The power of baptism on the altar," water poured on it. Now it is useless to waste time on the mode here. The pitchers of water were poured on an altar of wood on stones, an altar of wood large enough to hold up and burn up an ox. Dipping is not in it, plunging is out of all question, and no one pretends that it was immersion.

We read from Lightfoot's *Horae Heb. et Tat III. 292*, (*Lou. Debate, 463*), of Benaiah, "he one day struck his foot against a dead tortoise, and went down to Siloam, where, breaking all the little particles of hail, he baptized himself, (*tabal*). This was on the coldest day in winter." Now the law, the New Testament, and Apocrypha all show this required baptism, and he did baptize himself. But surely he did not dip himself in "the little particles of hail" he melted in his hand.

We introduce another very important witness, Clemens Alexandrinus, born a little after John's death, wrote a vast

number of Greek works about A.D. 190. *Thirty-eight* volumes still survived in the fourth century, and an immense folio edition still survives. I read from p. 1352, vol. 1. He quotes Homer several times, and the last sentence before his quotation reads:

"In like manner they say it becomes those who have washed themselves (*loumenous*—i. e. *louo*) to go forth to sacrifice, pure and bright."

Clemens says:

"But purity is to think purely. And indeed the likeness (*eikon*) of (*ton baptisματος*) the baptism [as just seen in washing before sacrifice] was that which was handed down from Moses by the poets thus: Penelope, *having SPRINKLED herself with water* (*hudraenomenae*), having on her body clean garments, goes to prayer. And Telemachus * * * having washed his hands (*cheiras nipsamenos*) at the sea, prays to *Athanae* (Minerva) (Odyssey 11, 261.) This custom of the Jews, *as also they often* (*pollakis*) *baptized themselves upon a couch*—*epi koitae baptidzesthai*—(that is, when meals are over—as they sat on such often as well as on a *triclinium*), is well expressed in this wise: Be pure, not by washing (*loutro*), but by thinking."

Here notice—

1. The priestly washings of every kind, hands—all are denominated baptism.

2. "Penelope *sprinkled herself with water*," *hudor*, *water*, and *raino*, sprinkle. Liddell and Scott's Greek lexicon defines the word thus: "*to water, to sprinkle with water, to pour out libations to, to bathe, wash one's self*: Od. iv, 750, [*the very line just quoted*] *to pour water over one's body*." That is all. This is "*the image, likeness*" of the baptism Moses handed down.

3. "The Jews daily baptize [sitting] on a couch." What is the mode here? Washing the hands at the sea, and sprinkling water on the body, are the baptisms put alongside those practiced by the Jews. Such is the testimony of this learned Greek, so near the apostolic age.

VERSIONS.

THE VERSIONS.—In deference to and by request of my worthy opponent, I deferred the rest of the versions till we could dispose of other matters.

We beg of you to remember that *these* are by *far*, by almost *infinite* odds, the most accurate, impartial and reliable sources

of information, on this subject, that can be possibly adduced as to what were the meanings, *the usus loquendi* in the *apostolic* age. The critics he and I read to you, lived from 1500 to 1800 years after Christ. They wrote fifteen to seventeen hundred years after the apostles were all dead. Many wrote before some leading fathers of the third century were recovered. *The truth is, the versions have never been examined on this subject, till we had the honor to take hold of the question.* The ease with which Dr. Judd exposes Stuart's blunders, shows this, and it could have been greatly extended. Immersionists have quoted and used the versions as they have the lexicons and authorities. We have *both* sides here now; we will examine them, as I have at least fifteen or eighteen versions here with me. The Peshito and Arabic we have examined in our second day's investigations—fourth speech.

We showed that *baptidzo* is rendered by *amad* in Syriac and Arabic. That *amad* never means to dip. That no case has been found in the literature of the world in Syriac where it means to *immerse*. Nowhere is any word that properly means to immerse, or dip, ever rendered *amad*. On the contrary, *louo* (to wash, pour, sprinkle), is translated by *amad*. The pool of Siloam, in John ix, 7, where people "washed," is rendered by the noun of *amad*, several times in the Peshito. We saw that Castell tells us *primarily*—using that word which Michaelis in *his* edition of Castell abridges out as he does a great deal else, [I have *both*] it is to wash, *derivatively*, (Aphel) to immerse: nowhere so occurring in the New Testament. That it is the same in Arabic, as Dr. Graves told us emphatically, and as Judd agrees. But Castell tells us it is "to make wet with rain." Catafago tells us so in his recent lexicon, while Castell adds, to sprinkle, sprinkle with water, with dew, bedew, etc. Such a word translates *baptidzo* in Syriac and Arabic—the first in the *apostolic* age, the *latter* in the golden age of Arabic culture, when one man spoke seventy-two dialects; when the court of Al Raschid was the renown of the world for learning; when Aristotle, Homer and Plato were read, studied and rendered into Arabic. In *that* age, *baptidzo* was translated by *tzeva*, to besprinkle, baptize, by *gasala*, to wash, sprinkle, besprinkle, *never* dip, NEVER immerse. *Gasala*

repeatedly translates *nipto*, that *never* means dip, immerse, but *does mean to rain* as well as wash, pour—Job xx, 23, where Symmachus (second century) has it *brecho*; the Hebrew and English, *rain*. The Arabic word that translates *nipto* and *brecho*, sprinkle, translates *baptidzo*, *baptisma*, *baptismos*. Yet they claim the versions!! Later Syriac literature tells us of “the baptism of blood of martyrdom,” “baptism of tears.” Was *this dipping*? Could men be dipped in their own tears? immersed in their own blood, as they were martyred in various ways?

While the old Vulgate and Itala translate the other word in Syriac and Arabic for baptize, *tzeva*, by moisten once, twice by sprinkle, *conspargatur* and *infunderis*; the Al Koran applies it to baptism, and to the *juice of trees, their dripping sap*. Surely drops (*gutta*) of sap from the cut in a tree, a plant, etc., falling on objects is not *immersion*. Yet it was *baptism*. And *this* word was supposed to be so universally used for *immersion*, that Moses Stuart *surrendered* it to them and founded a *leading* argument on it!! This shows how superficially he examined the whole issue. Yea, so fully given over to immersion were many lexicographers, that Gesenius tells us this word in *Hebrew* is “to dip in, to immerse; hence to tinge, to dye,” and “in the Targums often, to dye, to color;” whereas it *nowhere occurs in the Bible at all*. The *Chaldee* word *tzeva* does—only in Daniel—is rendered *sprinkle* by Jerome, as just seen. Nebuchadnezzar’s body baptized, sprinkled with the dew of heaven,” rendered “wet, moisten” by Gesenius. How dared he say it meant “immerse,” in Hebrew, when *there is no such Hebrew word*? When careful to tell us it means “dye” in Targums, why did he not tell us it means *wash* there *ten* times to where it means “dye” once, and translates not only *tabal*, baptize, but *rachats*, *wash*, *pour*? In Num. xix, 7, 8, 10, 16, and Lev. viii, 6, where Moses washes Aaron and sons *at the door before the people*, it is *tzeva*; a clear case of affusion—*rachats* in Hebrew, *secho* in Onkelos.

Yet *such* lexicons are *forced* to sustain our cause with such *daring* antagonism as *this*! Yet they are called *Pedobaptists* in such a way as to leave the impression that *they were affusionists*, *reluctantly* supporting the other sects!

ITALA AND VULGATE.

The *Itala* made in the second century by converts of the apostolic age, is next to the Peshito, the most valuable translation we have. Jerome's Vulgate and it, are the same on those points:

1st. They transfer *baptidzo*, in every instance in the New Testament, not translating it at all.

2d. They translate *tabal* (Greek *baptidzo*) 2 Kings v, 14, by wash, *lavo*, (wash, bedew, sprinkle).

3d. They translate *bapto*, sprinkle—Rev. xix, 13.

4th. They translate the Chaldee for baptize, same as Syriac and Arabic, *tzeva*, by "to sprinkle" twice. *

5. They never translate either *baptidzo* or *tabal* by baptize.

ÆTHIOPIC VERSION.

Of this version, that zealous Baptist Dr. Gale, says:

"The Syriac and Ethiopic versions, which for their antiquity, must be thought almost as valuable and authentic as the original itself, being made from primitive copies, in or very near the times of the apostles, and rendering the passage (Rom. xix, 13 *bapto*) by words that signify to sprinkle, * * * very strongly argue that he (Origen) has preserved the same word which was in the autograph."†

This is more just of the Syriac, Sahidic, and Itala. The Ethiopic has a word expressing definitely to immerse, *maab*, "to overflow, submerge." It is never used for baptize, etc. Now this version renders —

1. *Bapto* by to sprinkle, as Dr. Gale observes.

2. It renders (*katharismos*) purification, always performed by sprinklings. (See John ii, 6; Heb. ix, 13, 19, 21; Numbers viii, 7; xix, 13–15,) by baptism.

3. It never renders baptize by immerse or any word equivalent to dip.

4. It renders *baptidzo tamak*, which Castell renders, "to be baptized, to baptize." Neither he nor Hottinger renders it by dip, plunge or immerse. It is the same as *tamash* in other

* Dan. iv.—*Conspargatur—infunderis*.

† Reflect. on Wall's Hist. Inf. Bap. Letter V. vol. II, 118 Ed. of 1862.

Hephil form—derivative meaning—by plunge, wet, dip, wash, and gives Ps. vi, 7, “baptized my couch with my tears,” as his first proof text.* It is kindred with *tamal* also, which never implies immersion, but constantly applies to affusions. It renders John v, 4: ix, 7, Siloam, “where people washed, by baptizing,” as the Syriac. Castell gives both plunge and moisten—*rigavit*, always affusion—as meanings of *tamash*.

5. This version renders *baptidzo* by *mo, moi*—“water.” It is the same root with *moh*—“sprinkled with water, pour, rain, water, juice, fluid, water.”† *m’ho*, moisten, pour. Here is one of the words translated from *baptidzo* that simply means to water, without specifying mode, while the same word essentially—same root, means to sprinkle with water, water, pour, rain. So testifies this great author.

THE AMBARIC—a later version—renders it as the one just noticed generally, and need not to be noticed separately.

THE COPTIC.

The Coptic was executed in the third century, and is of great value, being made so near the apostolic age. It renders:

1. *Bapto* by sprinkle, Rev. xix, 13.
2. Renders *baptidzo*, baptize by *tamaka*, same as above in Ethiopic—a word of affusion, not of immersion. It is kindred also with *tanon*, moisten, make wet.‡
3. It renders it by *tomas*, same as *tamash*, which see above.

EGYPTIAN.

The Egyptian of the third century renders *baptidzo* by *oms*, same root as Arabic *amada*—sprinkle, make wet, wash, baptize.

* Hephil (of *tamash*) mersit, tinxit, intinxit, lavit, p. 6 [7] liquefaciam.

† Castell aqua perfusus est, pluviam fudit, aqua aquam, etc.—no immersion. Hottinger—tinxit, baptizavit, moisten, baptize.

Ethiopic, m’ho liquefcere, liqueferi, fundi.—Castell, 2003.

‡ Humectatus est, humidus, humectavit.—Castell.

Oriental Versions—same word. Schindler renders it in
BASMURIC.

The Basmuric belongs also to the third century.

1. *Bapto* is rendered sprinkle as well as dip.
2. Transfers *baptidzo*. SAHIDIC.

The SAHIDIC of the second century, and executed by the converts of the apostles, or co-laborers. It is of great value, but simply transfers *baptidzo* as it relates to the ordinance. There is no doubt that, could we get copies of the SAHIDIC, and ancient Basmuric and Egyptian, as we have conveniently the Ethiopic, Arabic, Syriac, our labors would be as richly compensated as they have been in those languages. The Sahidic renders *bapto* sprinkle as well as dip, but in no instance does the *dip* submerge or envelope the object in these cases.

PERSIC.

The Persic renders *baptidzo* by several words. It has a word (*gutha*) meaning emphatically to immerse. See Golius in Castell, p. 408. But it never renders *baptidzo* by it or any word implying immersion. It renders *baptidzo*—

1. By *sustan*, *shustidan*, thus defined in Golius' lexicon. Washing, baptism; to wash, (besprinkle, cleanse); washing, cleansing, baptize. [*Lavacrum*, *Baptismus*, *Lavare*; Gen; xvii, 4; xix, 2; Ex. ii, 5; John iii, 25, (*lotio*), lotus, John xiii, 10, *baptizare*, Matt. iii, 6-13.—Castell.

2. It renders it by *shuhar*, *shue*, to give a bath or administer a washing [pour water for it] to fall in drops of water, distill; to baptize. [*Lavandum dare*, *Stillare*; * * *Baptizare*.—Castell.

3. It renders *purifying*, John iii, 25, by baptism.

4. *Baptidzo* is translated into the word used, Exodus ii, 5, washed, *epi*, at the river; Gen. xviii, 4, where it was with "a little water;" in John xiii, 10, where Christ washed their feet, unquestionably by applying the water; for he would not plunge all their feet into the same basin, in "unclean" water. It was water "upon" the feet. Luke vii, 38-9-44.

Let us now see how *amad* was used in the ancient Syriac literature and councils.

The Lutheran version 1522 renders *baptidzo* by

1. *Taufen*, to baptize, without implying mode. But when the version was made, *sprinkling* and *pouring* were the general yea, universal practice. This all acknowledge, and A. Campbell says so, quoting Erasmus.† Luther poured the water on the infant's head when he said, "*Ich taufe euch mit wasser.*" It is downright dishonesty to pretend that by *taufen* he and the various German translators meant dip, whatever may have been its former force. With them it neither meant dip sprinkle nor pour, but was used as the Latins used *baptidzo*, and *tingo* for baptize.

2. In 2 Kings, v, 14, *tabal*—*baptidzo*; Luke xi, 38; Mark vii 4, *baptidzo* is rendered *waschen*.

3. *Bapto* is rendered in Rev. xix, 13, sprinkle *besprengt*.

The Lusitanian version renders both words in the same places the same—*baptidzo*, wash—*bapto*, sprinkle.

The Jerusalem Targum renders *rachats*, ("wash, pour,") by *taval* and *tabal* by *rachats*, the latter also by "WASHED their face with tears," Gen. 43, 30. This shows that these words were words of affusion.

The Arabic and the Targum render Ps. vi, 6, 7, "wet my couch with my tears," *brecho* with the word that translates *baptidzo* and *tabal*.

It is useless to multiply facts. The sum of all is this:

1. For fifteen hundred years after the Christian Era, not a single version made from the original Scripture, supports a case of immersion.

2. Every version made, supported affusion, and with overwhelming force. We have not quoted Wickliffe and several German versions falsified by Conant as made from the Greek. They were all made from the Latin, and hence have nothing to do with *baptidzo* or *bapto*. They would support us, especially Wickliffe, who has baptize, wash, and for the *aspersa* of Jerome, sprinkle. But Wickliffe never saw a Greek Testa-

†Chris. Baptisms, p. 192, "Erasmus, who spent some time in England, during the reign of Henry VIII., observes, 'With us, [the Dutch], the baptized, have the water poured on them. In England they are dipped.'"

ment. The same applies to the Rheims, as to its use, made from the Latin.

1. We began with the plain, English version made by immersionists, and the record is so clear in favor of affusion, that their partiality could not destroy it.

2. We appealed to *Bapto*, the root of the word, and found sprinkle to be its primary meaning.

3. We appealed to *baptidzo* (1) in lexicons, and affusion was unanimously sustained, (2) in the classics, and infallibly certain sprinkle appeared as the primary meaning, of the word. (3) The fathers were summoned, and they sustained affusion.

4. We turned to the Hebrew, the Semetic family of languages, and sprinkle was found to be the primary meaning of baptize.

5. We appealed to the Hebrew customs, and Rabbins, and they sustained affusion overwhelmingly.

6. We called in the grand army of versions, and the field of controversy was swept, and affusion remained in absolute possession of the field.

7. The testimony of the learned critics, Doctors of Theology ancient and modern, annotators, commentators and antiquarians, and they, in crushing numbers, rally to the cause.

AFFUSION IS THE ONLY ABSOLUTELY ESTABLISHED FORM OF APOSTOLIC BAPTISM.—[*Time out.*]

DR. GRAVES' THIRTEENTH SPEECH.

Argument.

MR. PRESIDENT:—It was to prevent all this useless discussion as to where we are to look for the primary, grammatical, real signification of our terms, that I collated from the highest sources, those rules of interpretation which I presented in my first speech, and to which, at the very outstart, my opponent cordially assented. He has been going back upon them from his first speech. They are nevertheless the rules that must govern this discussion, and by which I shall examine all the lexicographers I produce in this court. Let it then be distinctly borne in mind, that the first meanings given by the lexicons are the primary and literal meanings, and therefore, as Ernesti, Morus and Stuart agree, the only real ones, whatever their etymology may seem to demand or their "*historical primaries*" may have been.

I. CLASSIC GREEK.

In opening the lexicons, allow me to quote two statements of Prof. Toy, of Greenville Seminary:

"1. Lexicons are authoritative and valuable only as they establish meanings given by quotations from approved authors.

"2. One good lexicon will be worth more than a host of inferior ones. A mere array of unauthoritative lexicons counts for little among scholars."

I here give notice that I shall, for the most part, give only the *primary* or literal meanings, for with these only we have to do in ascertaining the *literal usus loquendi of baptidzo*. Eld. Ditzler, you will find, universally gives the metaphorical meanings, never the primary, unless called upon to do so, and I therefore challenge every one of his lexicons and Greek authors *unless he gives the text and the definitions preceding the one he selects*.

By general consent the three most authoritative German-Greek lexicons are those of Stephanus, Schleusner, and Rost

& Palm. The three best English lexicons are those of Liddell & Scott, Robinson, and Sophocles, latest editions. These six are as good as sixty inferior ones.

LIDDELL & SCOTT.—“*Baptidzo*. To dip in or under water; of ships to sink them: *ebaptisan ten polin*, metaphorical of the crowds who flocked into Jerusalem at the time of the siege:—Pass., to bathe; *hoi bebaptismenoi*, soaked in wine, Lat., *vino madidi*; *ophlemasi beb*, over head and ears in debt; *meirakion baptizomenon*, a boy drowned [overwhelmed] with questions. 2. To draw water. 3. To baptize.”

“*Baptisma*, baptism. *Baptismos*, a dipping in water; baptism. *Baptistes*, one that dips; a baptizer. *ho bapt.* the Baptist.”

Sophocles—(Greek Lex. of the Roman and Byzantine periods, B. C. 146. A. D. 1100—1870.) “To dip, to immerse.”

Sophocles, in effect, says that *baptidzo* was used by the Greek only in the sense of immerse, and that the writers of the New Testament knew no other sense.

ROST & PALM.—“*Baptidzo*. Oft wiederholt eintauchen, untertauchen; dan benetzen anbeuchten begiessen.” “*Baptidzo*. To dip in, or under, often and repeatedly, hence to wet, moisten, pour over.”

All can see that “to wet,” “to moisten,” is given as the effect of the act, and is not a definition.

ROBINSON.—“*Baptidzo*. A frequentative in form but not in fact; to immerse, to sink. 2. To wash, to cleanse by washing; trans. Mid. and aor. 1 pass. in middle sense, to wash one's self to bathe, to perform ablution. 3. To baptize to administer the rite of baptism, either that of John or of Christ. Pass. and Mid., to be baptized, or to cause one's self to be baptized, i. e., generally to receive baptism.”

DONNEGAN.—“*Baptidzo*. To immerse repeatedly into a liquid; to submerge—to soak thoroughly, to saturate.”

Here “to soak” or “saturate” is the effect of the act.

STEPHANUS.—“*Baptidzo*. *Mergo*, seu *inmergo*, ut quæ tingendi, aut abluendi gratia aquæ immergimus. (To immerse or immerge, as things which we immerse for the sake of dyeing or washing in water.) *Mergo*, i. e., *Submergo*, obruo aqua. [To immerse i. e. to submerge, to overwhelm in water.]”

SCHLEUSNER.—*Baptidzo*. 1. *Proprie*; *immergo*, ac *intingo*, in aquam *mergo*, a *BAPTO*, et respondet *Hebraico tabal*, 2 Kings v, 14. (Properly to immerge and dip in, to immerse into water, from *bapto*; and it answers to the Hebrew *taval* 2 K. v, 14.)” * * *

PARKHURST.—“*Baptidzo*. 1. To dip, immerse, or plunge in water. 2. *Baptizomai*. Mid. and Pass., to wash one's self, be washed, wash that is, the hands by immersion or dipping in water. The Seventy use *baptizomai*, Mid. for washing one's self by immersion. 3. To baptize to immerse in, or wash with, water in token of purification from sin, and from spiritual pollution.

"*Baptisma*. 1. An immersion or washing with water. 2. Baptism or immersion in grievous and overwhelming afflictions and sufferings. *Baptismos*. An immersion or washing in water."

SCHREVELIUS.—"*BAPTIDZO*. *Baptidzo, mergo, abluo, lavo*. (To baptize immerse, wash off, bathe.)

"*Baptisma*. *Immersio, tinctio, baptisma*. (Immersion, dipping, baptism.)"

WRIGHT.—"*Baptidzo*. I dip, immerse, plunge, saturate, baptize, overwhelm."

LEIGH.—"*Baptidzo*. The native and proper signification of it is, to dip into water, or to plunge under water. *Baptisma*. 1. *Dipping into water, or washing with water, often*."

GREENFIELD.—"*Baptidzo*. To immerse, immerge, submerge, sink."

EWING.—"Its primary signification, I cover with water, or some other fluid. 1. I plunge into, or sink completely under water."

HEDERIC.—"*Baptidzo*. *Mergo, immergo, aqua obruo*. 2. *Abluo, lavo*. 3. *Baptidzo*. (To immerse, immerge, overwhelm in water. *Baptisma*. *Immersio, tinctio*.) Immersion, dipping into."

SCAPULA.—"*Baptidzo*. *Mergo, seu immergo*. (To immerse or immerge.) *Item tingo; ut quæ tingendi, aut ab'ucendi gratia aquæ immergimus*; (also to immerse, as we immerse things for the sake of dyeing or washing them in water;) *item mergo, submergo, obruo aquæ*. Also to immerse, to submerge, to overwhelm in water.) *Baptismos et Baptisma*. *Mersio, Lotio, Ablutio, ipse immergendi, item lavendi, seu abluendi actus*.) Immersion, washing, washing clean; the act itself of immersing; also of washing, or washing clean.)"

SUIDAS.—"*Baptidzo*. *Mergo, Immergo, Tingo, Intingo, Madefacio, Lavo, Abluo, Purgo*. (To immerse, to immerge, to dip, to dip in.)"

SCHOETTGEN.—"*Baptidzo* from *Bapto*; properly to plunge, to immerse, or plunge in water."

DUNBAR.—"*Baptidzo*. To dip, immerse, submerge, plunge, sink, overwhelm; to sink."

LAING.—"*Baptidzo*. To baptize, to plunge in water."

MOREL.—"*Baptidzo*. 1. *Mergo, immergo, aqua obruo*. (To immerse, to immerge, to overwhelm in water.)"

BASS.—"*Baptidzo*. To dip, immerse, plunge in water; to bathe one's self; to be immersed in sufferings and afflictions."

T. S. GREEN.—"*Baptidzo*, pr., to dip, immerse, to cleanse or purify by washing; to administer the rite of baptism, to baptize.

"*Baptismos*. Act of dipping or immersion; a baptism, an ablution."

"*Baptisma*, pr., immersion; baptism, ordinance of baptism."

SUICER says that "*bapto* signifies to dip, to dye by dipping; hence he is said *baptein udrian* (to dip a bucket) who draws water out of a well or a river, which cannot be done unless the whole bucket is immersed under water. Wool and garments are said *baptesthai* (to be dipped,) because

they are entirely immersed in the dyeing vat, that they may imbibe the color. *Baptidzo* has, very properly the same signification in the best writers. *Baptidzein eauton eis thalassan*, in the ancient poet, is, 'To plunge himself into the sea.' From the proper signification of the verb, *baptisma* or *baptismos* properly denotes immersion, or dipping into."

GROVE. *Baptidzo*. To dip, immerse, immerge, plunge."

JONES.—"*Baptidzo*. *I plunge, plunge* in water, dip, baptize; *plunge* in sleep, bury, overwhelm. *Baptisma*. Immersion, baptism, plunging in affliction."

STOKIUS.—*Baptidzo*. *Generatim ac vi vocis intinctionis ac immersionis baptidzo notionem obtinet. Speciatim propria est immergere ac intingere in aquam.* (Generally, and by force of the word, it has the idea of dipping in and immersing. With special propriety is it to immerse and to dip into water.")

ROBERTSON.—*Baptidzo*. *Mergo lavo*. (To immerse, to wash [or bathe].")

SCHWARZIUS.—"*Baptidzo*. To baptize, to immerse, to overwhelm, to dip into." [To authenticate this as the primary meaning of the term, he adduces the following authorities: Polybius, iii. c. 72; v. c. 47; Dio. xxxviii. p. 84; xxxvii. extr., p. 64; i. pp. 492, 502, 505. Porphyrius de Styge p. 282. Diodorus Siculus i. p. 33. Strabon, vi. p. 421. Josephus Bell. Judd. p. 259. Josephus Antiq. ix. c. § 2.] "To wash by immersing. Luke xi. 38; Matt. vii. 4."

MINTERT.—*Baptidzo*. To baptize; properly, indeed, it signifies to plunge, to immerse, to dip into water; but because it is common to plunge or dip a thing that it may be washed, hence also it signifies to wash, to wash clean. *Baptismos*. Immersion, dipping into, washing, washing clean. Properly, and according to its etymology, it denotes that washing which is performed by immersion."

PASOR.—"*Baptidzo; Immergo, abluo*. (To immerse, to wash clean)."—*Ingham*.

ALESTEDIUS.—"*Baptidzein* signifies only to immerse; not to wash, except by consequence."—*Ibid*.

BRETSCHNEIDER.—"*In baptidzo* is contained the idea of a complete immersion under water. An entire immersion belongs to the nature of baptism."—*Ibid*.

AST, in his *Platonic Lexicon*, renders *baptidzo* by "*obruo opprimo* (To cover over, to oppress or overwhelm.)"—*Ibid*.

Replication.

I regret that I am so often compelled to go back to repeat and re-discuss points which were presented two or three days ago. It certainly is not chargeable to me or to my method. It is because my opponent, as a rule, keeps either two or three days in advance of me, anticipating my argument, or as

many days in the rear, bringing up matter, and suggesting difficulties which he should have noticed at the time. He does this to distract and confuse me in the symmetrical presentation of my argument, and to break its force on the minds of the hearers. He pursues this method to gain time to prepare his defence. If he is indeed doing the best he can, I ought not to complain, but I wish it were otherwise, since this constant repetition is tiresome to the hearers, as it will be to the readers of this discussion. He opened his speech discussing the government of the dative, a matter which I presented to his notice, in my speech three days ago, but he develops no principle, and refers to no established grammatical rules that govern the construction of the dative with or without the preposition *en*. He says it "will do for children" to talk about the dative being used without *en*—the preposition *en*, in answer to the question *where?* or *wherein?* the place or element in which a thing is said to be, or be done! Yet, for this I gave the highest grammatical authority, as Matthiæ, and no rule is better known to grammarians. My opponent appears to claim that there are no fixed rules that compel the rendering of the dative, either with or without a preposition, denoting locality where, or element in which, an act is said to be performed, but our own fancy—that it may be rendered with, or in, or on, or at, or by, to suit our taste, or our creed! Should I pass by all this here, he would claim that I admitted its truth, when nothing is further from the fact. There are certain well known and fixed grammatical rules that govern the construction of language, and infallibly guide us in the proper rendering of foreign tongues, as the Greek, and to violate these rules, is to misconstrue and misinterpret the language; therefore we are not at liberty to translate sentences as we please. These rules are based upon the common usage of Greek writers, and by them we must be governed.

Now it is a fixed rule, that when the preposition *eis* is placed before the name of an element or object, that entrance from without to a point within is indicated, and it must be so rendered—*e. g.*, *elthentes eis ton oikon*—entering into the house; *phuge eis Aigupton*—flee into Egypt. "*Kai eis to pur ebale kai*

eis hudaten”—it hath cast him into the fire and into the water. “*Elthein eis ten geenan eis to pur*”—“to go into hell, into the fire,” etc. These cases illustrate what I mean when I say that the grammatical construction compels us to translate phrases in a certain manner. We are not at liberty to translate *eis* in these cases by any secondary meaning we may please to select, as *on*, *upon*, *at*, *near by*, but by *into*; therefore, the rule that *eis* with a verb of motion before the accusative of the object or element expresses fully the act of passing from one element into another. Therefore we are compelled to render such expressions as these “*ebapthisthe eis ton Jordanen*,” Mark i, 9, “was immersed into the Jordan.” “*Kai ebalen heauton eis ten thalassen*,” John xxi, 7—Peter girding his coat unto him, “cast himself into the sea.” Now apply this rule to the several Examples cited from Conant, which are contested by Elder Ditzler, No. 65, given to Agamemnon’s case—“*Kai baptidzon eis ten Copaidan limnen*,” and plunging, immersing himself into lake Copais.” The directions to the man of bad dreams, Example 64, “*baptison seauton eis thalassen*,” immerse, plunge thyself into the sea; also, in Example 70, *baptidzein holin es* [for *eis*] *gala gunaikos*,” etc., “immerse again into breast-milk and Egyptian ointment.” Thus have I, by this induction of cases, given him the demanded proof that will satisfy any scholar, that in all the above cases, the subject did pass from without to a point entirely within the place or enveloping element, and consequently that Agamemnon did pass “clear under” the waters of the charmed lake, and yet he survived, disproving Elder Ditzler’s oft-repeated assertion.

Now, let us notice again the rule that governs *en* with verbs denoting motion, or rest in a place. The preposition *en*, denotes that one thing is *in* or *upon* another, “it indicates an actual union or contact of two objects.”—*Kuhner’s Gr.*, p. 233, § 164, and always puts the noun in the dative.

The invariable rule is, that, with such verbs: 1st. When, time when, place where, or *element in* or *within which* anything is said to be, or to be enveloped the object must be put in the dative usually, with, but often, without the preposition—if without the preposition *en*, is understood, and the rendering *must* be *in*, or *within*.

Let us apply this plain rule to cases involved in this discussion:

1. "*En de tais hemerais ekeinai.*"—Matt. iii. 1.

This is evidently time when, and must be rendered, not with or after, or before, but *in* those days.

2. "*Kerusson en te eremo* Matt. iii. 1—not preaching with, or on, or at, but evidently implying place where, locality, and it must be rendered *in* the wilderness.

3. "*ebaptizonto en to Jordane.*" Matt. iii. 6—here evidently place where or within which the act was performed is indicated and we are not at liberty to translate it "near by," "on" or "at" or "with," but "were baptized *in* the Jordan.

4. So the statement "*Kai ebaptizonto pantes en ton Jordane pounto,*" Mark i. 5—place "where" or "in which," being clearly indicated, we may not render it on, at, by, or with, but we are compelled to translate it *in* the river Jordan.

5. "*Ego men baptidzo kumas en kudati*" Matt. iii. 11, *kudati* here is evidently a noun of *element*, earth, air, fire, *water* are elements, not *instruments*, and therefore the sentence may not be rendered, I indeed baptize you *with* water but *in* water.

6. Again, "*Autos humas baptizei en pneumati hagio Kai puri.*" Matt. iii. 2—the Holy Spirit here is by metonymy put for his gracious *influences* into which they were to enter and by which they would be surrounded, enveloped, pervaded. Therefore the element in which the baptism is performed cannot be grammatically rendered, by, with, on, but *in* the Holy Spirit, and *in* fire. *Kai* connecting, *puri* with, *pneumati* the preposition need not be repeated, but is understood. It is easy to tell whether *locality* or *element* is indicated.

Then there *en* is before the dative of cause, manner and instrument, which is also distinguished without the least difficulty, and this is also with or without a preposition, and *en* before such a noun is attracted from its native signification and rendered *with*—*e. g.*, "*en rabdo eltho pros humos*" 1 Cor. iv, 21. "Shall I come to you with a rod"—instrument. "*e. en agape pneumati te praitetos?*" "or in love?"—element—"and in the spirit of meekness?" here influence and not instrument is indicated, and therefore

it is not rendered *with*, but *in*. I do not intend to be lead back to the discussion of these Scriptures, satisfied as I am that I have elucidated them to the comprehension of the youngest accountable being, and, leaving them, I wish to call your attention to the oft avowed statements of my opponent concerning the three principal words that enter into this question, viz., *en*, *eis*, and *baptidzo*.

He has just denied what he admitted the first day.

1. That *in* is not the primary meaning of *en*. He now says: "There is no proof as to the primary meaning of *en*."

2. He emphatically denies that into is the primary meaning of *eis*,—never, when it is used in connection with baptism.

3. He also affirms that to dip, or to immerse is not the primary meaning of *baptidzo*—"that it never means dip," especially so when it refers to Christian baptism.

Now, does it not strike you Mr. President, as remarkably strange that these words are inveterately afflicted with the hydrophobia when they are brought in sight of the river Jordan, but complacent and very naturally disposed in all other localities?

Touching what are, and what are not primary significations philologically considered, there can be no controversy at this stage of the discussion. We agreed at the outset to abide by the decision of Ernesti, Morus, Horne, and Stuart, as laid down in our Rules of Interpretation, viz., they are the first definitions given in the lexicons, and these alone are the *true*, *proper and real*, and must decide the definition of *baptidzo*. He has discovered that these rules will be a two-edged sword in my hand to slay him, and hence he has fought them from the hour the light broke on his mind.

Having clearly defined the rule for the construction of the dative, let us now notice Elder Ditzler's revised and improved versions; his translations of, and criticisms on, the Examples I submitted from Conant's *Baptidzein*:

1. He says he has examined my thirty-ninth Example and "found it damagingly against me." What will Conant and Greek scholars think of this statement when I show them that

by a palpable mistranslation and misunderstanding of the original, he makes out his bill of damages to the satisfaction of his admiring friends? He says "the *ship* was baptized, but not immersed, but just about to be—*i. e.* sunk," etc. I will give the text, to make plain his error, to all who can read either Greek or English.

EXAMPLE 39.

Here is the Greek text:

Ede de baptidzomenoon kai kata dunai mikron apoleipontoon, epecheiroun ten prooten enoi toon les toon eis ten edian autoon meteis bainein akaton:

"And already *becoming immersed* (baptized), and wanting little of *sinking*, some of the pirates at first attempted to leave, and get aboard of their own bark."

Now, instead of the *ship* being baptized, the text says the *pirates* already becoming immersed, and wanting a little of sinking—*i. e.* about to drown by being so often immersed, some of them attempted to leave the vessel they had seized and could not manage, and get back on their own. Now I respectfully ask whose *cause* and whose *scholarship* does this translation and criticism "damage?" To what shall I attribute this palpable mistranslation and misconstruction?

His version of Example 16 is rather an improvement on his former criticism, for hitherto, the ship was not immersed, for had it been so, the barbarians were really running under the water in confusion, but he now concludes that the ship was really baptized and went to the bottom. Well, this is something gained, for we have here one of the definitions of *baptidzo* given by Schleusner, to sink in the sense of to destroy—in which sense he says it is never used in the New Testament—but in that of, to dip.

I must again notice his disposition of the 22 Example I gave to disprove his declaration that, "in all classic Greek not an instance can be produced where a living being was immersed who survived." He affirmed yesterday that, according to the Greek text, the heads of the soldiers were never under the water while they were baptized! To the text, then, we

must again appeal. Here are the words: "*Kai sun autois ebaptizonto skaphesi.*" "And they were immersed or submerged with their vessels." Do you say sprinkle or pour *with* their vessels, as you would have John sprinkle the people *with* water? How sprinkle or pour the soldiers with vessels!

But their vessels were submerged. Elder Ditzler admits this, therefore the very same verb submerged the sailors, but all did not perish, for rising to the surface, they were overtaken and killed. He returns, feebly indeed, to Example 16. He defines now *aei* by "all the time," "*baronutes*" by immersing—in Elder Ditzler's sense—"sinking down under the water," "sinking to the bottom and remaining there, to drown."

His revised translation, then, seems to be: All the time sinking him down to the bottom, and holding him there—"they baptized his face so it suffocated him!" Shades of classic Greeks, did you ever hear the like of this?

Conant's translation is literally correct. I would render *aei*, on the authority of Schleusner, *sæpe*, "frequenter," frequently pressing him down, and dipping him as if in sport, they did not desist till they had entirely suffocated him."

Here are frequent immersions, before death ensued, as there were in the dipping match of King Philip with the Pancratiast, in Example 156, which explains the sport in which Aristobulus perished.

His last notice of Example 59, is brief indeed. "How could they be immersed by *baptidzo* here, when *kataduno*, "immerse," has to come after to immerse them." If he would only be willing to use *baptidzo* in the sense this author evidently does, and as all Greek authors do, he would have no trouble in understanding the record. The soldiers all immersed themselves, and sank down into the pits—to the bottom if you will—for *kataduno* denotes—a sinking deeper than *baptidzo*, which simply puts them "clean under;" but they did not all remain submerged, though some did; the majority rose to the surface, but were rendered useless, by being saturated with mud and water—while many perished.

This example also disproves his assertion that no living being ever survived an immersion effected by *baptidzo*

He admits that he had his accusative and dative badly mixed, and the fox's tail in place of the *tow* that was dipped in oil and bound to it in Example 86; but his friends were far better satisfied with it as "an able and most triumphant reply," than they seem with to-day's effort! He now renders it the *tow* was baptized with oil, but unfortunately *stupeion* *tow* is not the subject but the direct object of the verb *baptidas*, and *elaio* is the simple dative of *element* in, or within which the act denoted by the verb took place. Apply the rule governing the dative which I have explained in order to meet this and other cases, and we are compelled to translate this as Conant has, "dipping the tow in oil," etc. There is no avoiding the conclusion.

To convince all that this is not a mere partisan translation, I call your attention to the translation of similar cases by Stuart whose learning you have heard my friend extol so highly.

"They dip the wool *themo* [Dative of element] in warm water" —Aristophanes *Eccles*.

"*Hudati baptidzesthi* [which he gives as dative of element and translates by the rule] is plunged in water."

Another from Strabo, which he translates "dipped *oistois* in the gall of serpents."

Dr. Conant gives one in Example 79 which has the preposition expressed "that like as wool *baptisthen en bammati* [the dative of element] dipped in dye" etc.

Elder Ditzler declares on his scholarly reputation that Example 71 was no case of dipping—the hot iron was cooled by sprinkling water upon it. Let us examine it.

EXAMPLE 71.

Homeric Allegories, ch. 9.* The writer explains the ground of the allegory (as he regards it) of Neptune freeing Mars from Vulcan, thus:

"Since the mass of iron, drawn red hot from the furnace, is PLUNGED (BAPTIZED) in water; and the fiery glow, by its own nature quenched with water, ceases."

The text in question stands thus "*ho tou siderou mudros hel-*

* The work of an old Greek grammarian, of uncertain date; attributed (falsely) to Heraclides Pontecus, fourth century before Christ.

kustheis hudati baptidzetai.” Here we evidently have the simple dative of element in or within which the act was performed, and therefore I render it dipped or plunged in water &c. He says this could not have been the mode for the hot mass of iron would have thrown all the water out of the tub; and ruined the iron. I wish to take the testimony of Stuart (Pedobaptist) as a scholar, and then leave it to all the blacksmiths present, to decide the case by their practice.

Heraclides Ponticus, a disciple of Aristotle, Allegor. p. 495, says: *When a piece of iron is taken red hot from the fire, and PLUNGED in the water, the heat being quenched by the peculiar nature of the water, ceases.*—Stuart.

Again “iron *plunged* into water in order to harden it.”

The learned Gesner translated this very 71st Example which Eld. Ditzler says is no case of dipping thus:

“*Siquidem ignea ferri massa, fornicibus extracti, aqua. immergitur.*”

“If indeed the fiery mass of iron drawn from the furnaces is immersed in water.”

The Latin smiths doubtlessly cooled iron as the Greeks did, and I remember a case or two that cannot be disputed. Speaking of the Cyclops forging the arms for Æneas, Virgil says: “*Alii stridentia tinguunt æra lacu.*” “Others dip the hissing brass in the lake”—*i. e.*, the water of the lake.

Here is another.

“*Ensem Stygia candentem tinxerat unda,*” “had dipped—immersed—the red-hot sword in the Stygian wave.”

No scholar would read it otherwise. Thus the Latin smiths cooled their red-hot metals, and so we think the Greek smiths did also.

Mr. President, my opponent complains that I have questioned his scholarship in this discussion. I have been compelled in protecting my argument, to question most of his translations and interpretations of authors, and by the rules governing the construction of the Greek, I have shown they were palpably incorrect. Now I have to attribute this to his lack of familiarity with the language or to a lack of honesty and fair dealing, and I charitably attribute it to the former. If he will but present authors fairly, translate them grammatically, and interpret them logically, he will have no occasion to complain of me.

He is never done with Ezekiel, which I have noticed and protested against the use he makes of it. He seems either inveterately mystified about it or is determined to mystify the minds of others. What does he now say? that "the word purify in Hebrew is here translated in Syriac by *baptize*. In the Greek it is *brecho*, sprinkling, rain. The mode is given. It needs no lexicon." Now, with all due courtesy, this is unmeaning jargon to me; "translated in the Syriac by *baptize*!" What does he *mean*? Is the word *baptize* in Syriac? Of course not, it is an English word. Does he mean by the word *amad*, the only word that is used in the Syriac Version as the appropriate synonym of *baptidzo*? If he means this, the statement cannot be justified by one single instance; *tzeva*, it is true, does mean to dip in Syriac, and *figuratively*, to wet, to moisten, in which sense it is doubtless used here, but let it be remembered that *tzeva* is never used in the Syriac Version when describing or referring to Christian baptism, no more than *bapto*, to dip, is used in the Greek Testament, when referring to the same rite. There are two other cases always used with great confidence by my opponent, (as he quotes it from his Louisville Debate,) to which I have time to allude but briefly.

1. The one is found in Lightfoot's *Horæ Heb. et Fat.* III, 292. The text is Hebrew, and I have not the book with me, and Elder Ditzler does not bring it forward, but translates the passage after his usual manner, giving but one word, *taval*, but makes it out to mean that Benaiah baptized himself at Siloam with little particles of hail which he melted in his hand! I think he misrepresents the whole passage. I reproduce it as he gave it:

"Benaiah, "he one day struck his foot against a dead tortoise, and went down to Siloam, where, breaking all the little particles of hail, he baptized himself, (*tabal*). This was on the coldest day in winter." Now the law, the New Testament, and Apocrypha all show this required baptism, and he did baptize himself. But surely he did not dip himself in "the little particles of hail" he melted in his hand."

It is given as an instance of how scrupulously Benaiah, who had polluted himself by touching the dead tortoise, observed the law for purification from ceremonial uncleanness. That law required the bathing—immersion of the whole body. He

went down to Siloam, where, breaking all the ice, for it was in the depth of winter, he—*tabalized*—immersed himself. This was what the law of Moses—not of the *New Testament*—required, and this is what the verb *taval* in Hebrew signifies, and nothing *less than an immersion*. Comment is unnecessary.

The next case is a more delicate one to notice, but fidelity to truth requires it. He translates it in his usual style, from the Greek of Clement, so interlocuted that nothing certain can be made of it, but dogmatically asserts that it testifies that the Jews were wont to baptize themselves “*epi koitæ*” upon a couch.

The text in which *epi koitæ* occurs, is given in Braden and Hughey’s Debate, and quoted by Elder Wilkes in the Louisville Debate, p. 619, and stands thus:

“E dudrenamene kathara chroil imate echousa, he Penelope epi ten euchen herchetai. Telemachos de, cheiras nips amenos alos euchete Athene, clthos toutu Joudaion os Kai to pollakis epi koite baptidzesthai.”

Which I translate: “Having bathed herself and put on clean garments, Penelope goes to prayer. But Telemachus having washed his hands at the surging sea, prays to Minerva. As this is the custom of the Jews, and that, generally, after the couch—to immerse themselves—or take a bath.”

Epi, generally means upon, and should this be insisted upon here, then it should be translated, upon sleeping, for *koitæ* is equivalent to the masculine *koitos*, or sleeping; and it is the custom with us to bathe after sleeping. If it is after the enjoyment of the bed, the marital or marriage bed, as some critics think, then the law for the bath, the immersion of the whole body in water may be found in Lev. xv, 16–18.

I here again protest against Elder Ditzler again referring to authorities in his loose unreliable manner, without producing the full original text of what he pretends to translate. I have seen enough, in these few days, to convince me that when he translates or construes language or lexicons to prove his assertion that the primary meaning of *baptidzo* is to sprinkle, *never to immerse*, that he cannot be relied upon.

As for the versions, I will take their testimony, after you have heard what lexicographers have to say.—[*Time out.*

DR. DITZLER'S THIRTEENTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—At last Dr. Graves brings up his lexicons—a motly, mixed crowd—as miscellaneous in character, and as unclassified as they are botched and garbled, we will not say intentionally, but in fact. I introduced mine on Greek in the first speech I made. He comes up on the fourth day to quote them, putting them out of all order. Now, to show you what reliability can be placed in his array, we take a few.

1. He makes Stephan's Scapula say *baptidzo* is to "immerse things in water for the sake of *dyeing*," etc. 1. *Baptidzo* is never applied to *dyeing*, and Dr. Graves knows it. 2. We never dip in water (*agua*) to dye. Thus he makes these old immersionist founders of lexicography talk most silly.

2. He quotes Suidas on *baptidzo*, "to immerse," etc., etc. Now, Suidas, as I said in my opening speech, I think, does not define *baptidzo*, as Dr. Conant will tell him if he won't believe me. I know in Rice, etc., he is quoted thus, borrowed second hand, and it shows how immersionists spin out meanings to suit themselves, as he borrows it from them. Suidas only defines *bapto*, and gives it only *one* definition, viz: *pluno*, to wash. Stephanus will show him that, if he never saw Suidas.

3. He quotes Leigh. Leigh says just the reverse of what Dr. Graves quotes him as saying. That quotation is what *another* says, and Leigh quotes it to show what both parties say. It is not Leigh's definition.

4. He leaves out *the whole* New Testament definition of Stephanus, so misquotes Schleusner as to make him say the reverse of what he said, as a perusal of him in my opening speech, where he is accurately and fully quoted, will show.

Stokius is utterly perverted, as a perusal of his words in my first speech will show. He held that *always* in the ordinance

in the New Testament, it was wash, cleanse, *and by affusion.*

Take now his report of Rost & Palm—a great work. He has it: “to dip in or under, often and repeatedly,” etc. Now, 1. Where does *baptidzo* mean “to dip in or under, often and repeatedly?” Find a case. Yet *this* is by *odds* the best lexicon he has quoted. Post & Palm give “besprinkle” *begeissen*, “generally, *to sprinkle upon (ubergeissen) to pour upon (uberschutten)*” as the meaning of *baptidzo*. And they use these very words to define such specific acts themselves, when defining other words meaning sprinkle, pour upon. Hence, with these exposures, we adopt Dr. Graves’ word, and say, “*I challenge every one of Dr. Graves’ lexicons*, every one of his renderings and quotations as wholes, and assert that they wholly misrepresent the facts. He has filed up more little glossaries, lexicons defining only the words used by a single author, giving only the meanings supposed to be intended by the writers.

On classic usage, Dr. Graves took example 156 of Conant, to support dip. We need not reproduce the whole quotation. It tells of Philip who ran into the bath (*holumbaethran*) or pool. Here the Macedonians and he played at a match of baptizing. “Philip did not give over the (*diabaptidzomenos*) match, baptizing with the pancratiast, and sprinkling water in his face, until the soldiers, wearied out, dispersed.” Here notice.

1. It is not the simple New Testament word *baptidzo*, but a compound word, intensified by a preposition, *dia*, one that very much intensifies a word. Hence, it is not a proof, even if it did imply dip here or immerse.

2. It is the second century after Christ and tells nothing of the primary meaning. Though Philip lived before Christ, this writer, Polynaëus, lived in the second century after Christ.

3. It is evident they were not dipping each other, for to have continued as long as Polynaëus tells us they did, would have resulted in death. They evidently dashed water on each other, and Philip sprinkled it in the face of the pancratiast as distinguished from the mutual dashing it on each other. It is no proof of dipping. It is against it. If it were,

it is not the word used for baptism any way, being compounded. Many words of affusion come to mean immersion compounded with *dia*, *kata*, and the like.

4. Conant takes the view we did, "that sprinkling water in the face," "deprived of breath," p. 76. This applied to Aristobulus.

My brother is getting in earnest. This is the fourth day—it half gone—it is full time to do, or try to do, something.

On classic Greek he reads, "a piece of red hot iron." It reads, "the mass of iron." So Conant translates it: "Since, now, the mass of red hot iron drawn out of the furnaces [or drawn out by the smiths], *hudati baptidzetai*, is baptized with water." Who plunges a mass of iron, drawn red hot from the furnace, to temper it? It would explode all the water out of the tub all over the smiths. Bro. Horne tells me he saw a man tempering, with water, a piece of iron, pouring water on it, the last few days. Ofttimes have I seen it. The result in classics is all one way, all on our side.

He says the best lexicon stands on the shoulders of all the rest. He may not have looked at half a dozen. He may not have examined the texts they examined. But Passow, Rost and Palm, who made this great work, (issued vol. i., 1841,) do stand on all the rest. He spoke as if Passow lived away back among the old authors; 1841 is not so far back quite. This great work gives "sprinkle," "sprinkle upon," "pour upon;" the latter as its general use. Sophocles, whom Dr. Graves so eulogizes, only defines dark age Greek, gives dip as its first meaning, when it never means dip in classic Greek, as we have seen, and he quotes: "Baptize (*dakrusi*) in tears," he renders it. There is no *in* there. "Baptize *with* tears" is the Greek. So, Sophocles, an immersionist, is forced to support us. But what of the assertion that no lexicon gives sprinkle or pour as meanings of *baptidzo*? What will you now do with that, seeing that the whole body of the best on earth of all ages do give sprinkle and pour, and of the New Testament lexicons, all the standards, every one of the better class, Schleusner, Wahl, Schwarzius, Suicer, Leigh, Stokius, Robinson, etc?

But Grimm, he says, gives *mergo*, *immergo*, etc., under *bapto*,

the root. We will soon test his accuracy and fairness, then. We will show that in no instance in ancient Greek did *bapto* merse, or immerse, objects. All immersionists agree that the texts are the ultimate and only reliable appeal. But the learned and most scientific of all the Greek grammarians, Kuhner, gives "*tinge*," and a host of others, give "moisten" as the primary meaning of *bapto*.

I read Stokius, and Schleusner, and Suicer, etc. They are in evidence just as they record it. Stokius gives wash, cleanse, as its only New Testament use as a rite. He declares this (*lotio vel oblutio*) washing or cleansing could be and was accustomed to be accomplished (*soleat*) *adspergendo aquam*, by sprinkling the water (Mark vii., 4. ; Luke xi. 38) hence transferred to the solemn rite of baptism, and then quotes the texts in the gospels where it occurs as the rite. *He* does not stop there. *He* tells us it designates the pouring out of the Spirit, "since anciently—*i. e.*, since in the New Testament *baptidzo* applied to pouring, to affusion—the water was copiously poured on those baptized," hence *baptidzo* applied to the abundance of the gifts of the Spirit. We formerly, first speech, gave it in full, as also Schleusner. This author says immerse, dip, plunge in water, and answers to the Hebrew *tabal* in a certain place, and to *tabha* in certain ones; that is the translation of those words in the Seventy in certain places. But in this sense of the word, mere modal sense of dip, etc., it never occurs in the New Testament, but very frequently does in the Greek writers. We gave you the text in our first speech. He also gives pour forth—*profundo*. Suicer gave wash as the New Testament use of *baptidzo*, and (*per immersionem aut aspersionem*) by immersion or sprinkling as the modes or form of baptism. But if I can't find a Greek writer supporting sprinkle, pour, lexicous amount to nothing it seems. But we showed that all earlier use was sprinkle and pour. He has never even noticed the texts we mainly adduced, not once. Then Origen and Basil applied *baptidzo* to a case where "pour on water" was the command, and they poured on four pitchers of water three times on an altar of stones, timber, and an ox on that. Dr. Graves puts in "bathed." What did they bathe?

Washing was for purification, not for bathing as a religious rite. Bathe don't save him, though it is a hiding of the meaning. People are bathed in tears, but not immersed. We take shower baths; what is the mode? Pouring water over the fevered head, body, a limb; sprinkling it on bathes such parts. O what hiding behind ambiguous words! It is as when a hawk darts by young turkeys; all run and stick their heads under the clods, and think they are hid. But let us now take up *bapto*, the root of *baptidzo*, which gave *baptidzo* its first meaning.

BAPTO THE ROOT OF BAPTIDZO.

It is unfortunate that Gale, Carson, Stuart, Beecher (Ed.) and the hosts of authors so confound *bapto* and *baptidzo*, first quoting the one then the other, so that the whole is a confused mass, and only the Greek scholar able to tell which is *bapto*, which is *baptidzo*; and the other vices of these and all the rest—Drs. Dale, Conant, Ripley, A. Campbell, Vossius, Suicer, consist in disregarding the date of the writer, his merits as an accurate or less accurate exponent of language—in a word, in never noticing the fundamental principle that must be observed to have any claim to accuracy and truth in philology. Suffice to say, that on *bapto*, when treating of its primary meaning, that to be determined by “inspection of the passages,” the first Dr. Dale quotes is over twelve hundred years later than its first appearance in Homer, nearly eight hundred years later than when it appeared in *Æschylus*. Such has been the unscientific method on this subject. Is it a wonder no definite philological facts could be settled upon, but only some general surface facts seen, but not explained? More of this will come up under *baptidzo*. To trace the primary meaning, then, of *bapto*, the universally admitted root of *baptidzo*, we will give all the earliest occurrences of the word that have been found, unless by accident some have passed our observation, which would not materially change the question: for nearly all of them have been the result of immersion research, and they were searching for help for their side. We begin giving a summary of the pains of M. Stuart and Dale, when producing all they could on the word, they not noticing the ages in

which the authorities lived, Dale beginning with Æliau, A. D. third century.

DALE'S SUMMARY ON BAPTO.—Dip, 14; dye, 14; imbue, 7; temper, 2; gild, 1; smear, 1; stain, 1; wash, 4; moisteu, 2; wat, 1—47.

1. Of these forty-seven cases of *bapto*, we have thus thirty-three against fourteen for dip.

2. Some of these cases are partial dips, a very slight and not total penetration of the element by the object said to be *baptized*.

3. In not one is there a real *immerse*—i. e., sinking.

4. All the oldest authorities fail to furnish a case of *dip*, or *plunge*, or *immerse*, as given by this learned scholar, who hesitated not to urge for dip as the primary meaning. We give his rendering of the oldest authorities: Homer, stain, temper; Æschylus, temper; Herodotus, wash; Aristophanes, smear, wash, dye, dip; Sophocles, stain, temper; Euripides, stain; Aristotle, moisten; Plato, dye. This is a sample, though we may have not counted them as accurately as the other cases where more pains were demanded, fewer cases found, and where we took far more care for that reason.

5. For five hundred years after *bapto* appears, no case of literal dip, but stain where it is affusion, temper, wash.

6. Next two hundred years only twice dip against a large majority pointing to affusion, aspersion as the modes by which the objects were stained, moistened, washed, etc.

M. STUART. So strongly does he favor immersion that the Baptists boast that Pedobaptists will not publish his work, but they have done it. See Introduction by Eld. J. R. Graves to the Nashville edition of eighteen hundred and fifty-six.

1. Of fifty-six occurrences, in classic Greek and non-Biblical usage, he has it rendered dip, dye, color, smear, (Dr. Carson and others render it "smear,") thrust, bathe, tincture, tinge, plunge, wash—ten renderings. He has 7 full dips, 9 where it was partial not total—16 dip. This is 49 against 7 total dips, or 40 against 16 dips, partial and total,, 49 against 7 plunge, where it is doubtful. There are three that are partial—not

enveloped at all, 10—i. e., 46 against 10 for plunge in any way, and 36 against the sum total of cases of dip and plunge—no case of immerse.

If, as our opponents contend, current usage determines the primary meaning, dip is out of the question, and immerse does not even enter court for a plea. Henry Stephens, favoring immersion by prejudice and education, shows that *moisten*, *stain*, *paint* (*fuco*), *prevail* by odds over *dip*. He excels all lexicographers by vast odds, in his details on *bapto*. But let us present the facts in scientific order by dates.

FROM B. C. ONE THOUSAND TO B. C. FIVE HUNDRED—PERIOD FIVE HUNDRED YEARS. Two writers in this period use *bapto*, each twice.

1. Homer, B. C. 1000—popular date in round numbers. (1) *Batrachrom.* v. 218: Of a frog pierced and slain in battle, "He fell, without even looking upwards, and the lake was (*ebapteto*) tinged with blood." The blood spurting out—*affusion*—in small drops or sprinkling streams *bapted* the lake. Here, in the earliest use of *bapto*, the mode is not dipping, but *affusion*, and in a very slight way. A lake is *bapted* with the *affusion* of a few drops of blood. This gives us a clear insight into how dye, stain, color, came from *bapto*. (2) *Odyssey*, i. 302: "As when a smith (*baptei*) tempers a hatchet or huge pole axe with cold water," or "in cold water." Here *bapto* may be such a partial dip as we often witness in the shops where smiths temper an axe or hatchet. The edge is slightly dipped. Yet, from the allusion, it is possible it was the common case of a smith, putting cold water on the anvil and placing the hatchet or axe over it, hot, strikes with the hammer, when the report is tremendous, some times quite as loud as a gun: This is constantly done in tempering axes and hatchets. This is most likely Homer's allusion. Any way, immersion is out of the question, and dip, even partial, very doubtful.

Æschylus, born B. C. 529, uses *bapto* twice. 1. "For the wife has deprived each husband of life (*bapsasa*) staining the sword by slaughter." *Prometh.* v. 861. The mode involved in *bapto* here is easily determined. It does not say that the

sword is baptd into some penetrable matter—plunged in. It is stained, baptd, by the slaughter, cutting men's heads off, piercing their bodies, necks, etc., causing blood to effuse, pour out, be sprinkled upon earth, men and swords, gushed out upon them, by these processes the sword is stained.. Æschylus used it again. 2. "This garment (*ebaphaen*) stained by the blood of Ægisthus, is a witness to me." Here, the sword inflicting a fatal wound, the blood spurts out and besprinkles the garment, or is effused upon the garment, and being a coloring matter, not only moistens, but stains the garment.

Now, I have examined the record of *bapto* from its first use to five hundred years. It occurs four times. Three of these four occurrences it applies to affusion, once it is doubtful as to mode. The facts overwhelmingly sustain affusion, sprinkling, as the primary import of the word.

BAPTO, THE ROOT OF BAPTIDZO, FROM B. C. 500 till 429 B. C. FROM ÆSCHYLUS TO PLATO, EMBRACING SOPHOCLES, HERODOTUS, EURIPIDES, ARISTOPHANES, XENOPHON.

1. Sophocles, born B. C. 495, Ajax v, 95. "Thou hast well (*ebapsas*) stained thy sword (*pros*) by means of [or with respect to] the army of the Greeks." Same as above.

2. Herodotus, born B. C. 484 in Euterpe. 1. (*bas epi ton potamon*) "Going to the river he *ebapse*, washed himself." Exodus ii, 5. Pharoah's daughter went and "washed (*louo*) herself at the river." It is of an Egyptian, Herodotus is speaking, and they washed (*louo*) always for the object there named. He did not dip at the river, but washed at the river, as we say at the spring, fountain or river. So Judith, xii, 7, washed [*epi*] at the fountain. "The king's chariot was washed at the pool." 2. "Colored [*babammena*] garments." This is the earliest case where *bapto* is used in the sense of dyed or colored, save where blood from wounds besprinkles and stains garments. It is six hundred years later than the use of *bapto*, to stain, in Homer; forty years later than Æschylus uses it for staining by sprinkling or pouring; hence, we see stain is not derived from dip, nor from dye, but dye is derived from stain, stain from sprinkle. From sprinkling and pouring, when applied to the water of a river, we see wash or cleanse.

3. Euripides, born B. C. 480, uses *bapto* for dip where a bucket, and where a pitcher, is dipped to get water. Where this is done most generally the pitcher, etc., is not submerged, but only partly put into the liquids and suddenly withdrawn. "Dip a vessel and bring sea water." "Dip up with pitchers." He uses it for plunge. "He [*ebapse*] plunged (his sounding scimitar) into the flesh." Later used thus, by Lycophron: "Plunged his sword into the viper's bowels." Dionysius Halicar; "Plunge [*bapsas*] his spear between the other's ribs." He "at the same instant plunged his into his belly." In all the strongest immersionists can adduce, there is no total immersion. While the whole sword, spear, etc., is spoken of as bapting, only a small part enters the vipers bowels, the body, etc., etc.

4. Aristophanes, born about 450 B. C. (Conant), uses *bapto* unusually often not to have occasion, like Plato and Aristotle, to write on philosophy, nature, etc. 1. Speaking of Magnes, an old comic writer of Athens, he says: "Smearing himself [*baptomenos*] with frog colored [*batracheiois*] paints." Here the element coloring is applied to the person. No dip. Again: 2. "Do not adorn yourself with garments of variegated appearance, colored [*bapton*] at great cost." Here the colors seem to be the effect, as often then occurred, of needle work, taking different colors and working them into garments, bapting them thus. 3. Ornithobaptos, in Aves, p. 526, "a colored bird," referring to a bird of variegated plumage. Later, Greeks and Hebrews, as well as Arabs, speak of "sprinkled with colors," "sprinkled with grey," etc. Later Greeks refer to stones, birds, animals, etc., as bapting, where they have various colors imparted by nature. Birds and animals do not dip themselves in dye to receive their spots, plumage and variegated colors. 4. A bully speaking, Acharn, Act i, sc. 1. he says: "Lest I [*bapso-bamma*] stain you—cause the blood to stain you—with a Sardinian hue." Here *bapto* occurs twice, one being a noun form, derived from *bapto*, in both, dipping is out of the question. The blood streams from the stroke of a fist, as we say, give you a bloody nose or face. See this quoted by quite all leading lexicons on *bapto*.

5. "First, they wash [*baptos*] the wool in warm water." The wool is washed with the water as a means, not washed while in or under the water. Mere dipping wool is not washing it, hence it is no allusion to any mode. 6. The other instance, seventh case of *bapto* in same form, is compounded with *en*, and strengthens the verb so much that it is no test of the meaning of *bapto*, just as in, with *tingo* in Latin, entirely changes the meaning from moisten to dip. In Aristophanes, then, five times *bapto* occurs, and once *bamma*, same thing, making six occurrences. Not once is it dip, or plunge, or immerse. It is used where the element is applied by hand, or an instrument containing the element, to the person. So Ætion, Plutarch, Arrian, later, use *bapto* for dyeing the beard, dyeing the hair, coloring the parts about the eyes, the face with paints, as do other Greek writers. It was a very common habit to do this and it was described by *bapto*, *baptos*.

Plutarch, vi, 680: "Then perceiving that his beard was colored [*baptomenon*] and his head."

Arrian: "The Indians [*baptontai*] dyed their beards." They applied the matter or element to their beard.

Hippocrates, B. C. 430, quoted by Dr. Carson, speaking of a dyeing substance says: "When it drops [*evitaxæ*] upon the garments they are stained," *bapted*, *baptetai*.

Dropping a colored liquid "upon the garments" is hardly a clear case of dipping or immersing.

We have gone over the period from Homer to Plato, from 1000 B. C., to 429 B. C.

During these periods of illustrious writers,

1. Not once does it mean immerse.
2. Not once a total dip of the whole object, *bapted*.
3. Only three times does it mean to dip, even in the partial manner seen.

4. IN NOT ONE OF THE INSTANCES DOES IT DESCRIBE THE ACT PERFORMED BY BAPTISTS WHEN THEY BAPTIZE.

5. *It frequently applies to the very mode, and to its full extent, used by Pedobaptists.* It is not mode we demand as such at all.

The application of the element, water, to the subject in any way, meets all we demand.

6. Its prevailing use as yet was in cases of affusion and effusion, or aspersion.

FROM B. C. 429 TO A. D. 1—PLATO, ARISTOTLE, ETC.

Plato, born B. C. 429, uses it for dip, and constantly for dye, and need not be quoted dye where it was by dipping.

Aristotle, B. C. 384, speaks of dyeing, coloring and dipping once, where it is partial, dyeing where it is by dipping, says also, speaking of a dyeing substance—(*thibomenos de baptei kai anthidzei taen cheira*) “being pressed, it moistens (*bailtei*) and dyes (*anthidzei*) the hand.”

Here the mode cannot be mistaken. The fluid came upon, into contact with, the object moistened, and having coloring elements in it, (*anthidzei*) stains or dyes the hand.

Here the greatest of all Greek scholars in all ages, uses *bapto* for moisten, where it comes upon, or into contact with, the object moistened, by being pressed out of a substance, hence perfect effusion is the mode, the effect is to color, and not even *bapto*, but *anthidzo* describes that act.

Let us examine this word that means to dye, color, *anthidzo*. Stephanus. *Anthidzo*, to sprinkle with flowers, *conspergo*, *exanthidzo*, *tingo*, stain. Suidas, and other native Greeks, exchange it with *bapto*. Liddell and Scott's Greek lexicon *anthidzo*, to strew with flowers, to deck as with flowers, to dye, stain with colors, to bloom, to be dyed or painted. [Metaphorically.] A man whose hair is sprinkled with white. (Sophocles)

This shows how a word may come to mean to color, dye, stain, without dipping.

We have gone over ground enough to pause. Centuries more would tally with the above exhibit. Marcus Antonius speaks of the soul [*baptetai*] tinged by the thoughts, takes their hue. “Tinge it, then, *hapte*, by accustoming yourself to such thoughts.”

Diodorus Siculus, B. C. 69–30: “Coats [*baptais*] colored and flowered with various colors.” “Native warmth has

[*ebapsen*] tinged the above varieties of the growth of things (birds, precious stones, etc.) before mentioned." Tom. iii, 315; xi, 149. Later—*i. e.*, years after Christ, *bapto* came to apply to total dippings, which were sudden. In the dyeing among the ancients, we know too little to be able to say how long the garment remained in contact with the element, or how much of the garment at a time was dipped into the dye. We have no real proof that the whole object in any case at any and the same time was put into the dye. Granting it was, two facts are clear:

1. Dye is derivative, not primary. The history shows that.

2. Sprinkle, pour, dropping upon, were the earliest modes implied in *bapto*.

Take now the fact that in the Old and New Testaments *bapto* occurs a number of times, the following holds true:

1. It never applies there to an immersion.
2. It never involves envelopment in a single case. In John xii, 26, Mark xiv, 20, Luke xvi, 24, *embapto*, Matt. xxvi, 23, Lev. x, 6, etc.,* (the Old Testament cases will come in under Hebrew *tabal*, see Index), Rev. xix, 14. It never involves, in all the Bible, the putting of the whole object under the element.

3. In the only cases where it applies to the element of water unmixed with coloring elements, it has the force of sprinkle. Daniel iv, 30; v. 21, *ebaphæ* his (Nebuchadnezzar's) body was wet, sprinkled [*bapto*] with the dew of heaven." Theodotian made this version near the apostolic time. In Rev. xix, 13, it is used for sprinkle, and so rendered by the Ethiopic, Syriac, and seven of the most ancient and best versions. It is translated sprinkle by the three greatest of the Greek Fathers of the second and third centuries, Irenæus, Origen, and Hippolytus, all native Greeks.

Thus we see that sprinkle is the the primary meaning and inheres in *bapto* to the third century after Christ, that is enough, covers the case.

*See Exodus xii, 22; Lev. xiv, 16; iv, 17; ix, 9; xiv, 6-51, etc.

We have seen that dye, stain, color, paint, constantly come from words primarily meaning to sprinkle, others, to moisten, when it is by affusion. The facts become overwhelming.

We see in the above exhibit that the quantity of the baptizing element is wholly left out. In one case the blood of a frog applies to a lake--*ebapteto d'hai-mati limnæ*. A few drops baptes "the garments." The hand was baptes by the coloring moisture touching it. The body was "baptes by the dew [*apo*] from heaven." The blood of a slain bird baptes the living bird, hyssop, scarlet, wool and all. The vesture or outer garment is baptes with blood, compared to the grape juice in treading the wine press. Rev. xix, 1, with Is. lxiii, 1-3.

Again, no definite and single mode inheres in it. It comes to be used where by any possible process the wetting, the coloring, the staining matter comes upon the object, even where birds grow and stones are formed, colored by nature. We will see many other words in future of like use.

After these facts, which being presented, no one dare question them, to talk as Baptists do, that *bapto* always implies dip, is simply to shut one's eyes and seek to fan the sun into a sea of ice with a pea-cock's tail. After all this, it is a matter of indifference what Anthon, so paraded by our opponents, says in his letter, especially when he also thus writes and publishes, well supported in it too: "Baptæ. The priests of Cotytta. The name is derived from *bapto*, to tinge or dye, from their painting their cheeks and staining the parts around the eyes like women." Class. Dic., by Charles Anthon. Does dye, stain, come from dipping?

All facts, all philology, all history demonstrate

1. That sprinkle, moisten, was the primary meaning of *bapto*.

2. That stain, color, smear, are its next meanings, as sprinkling with coloring matter necessarily so resulted.

3. Sprinkling water washed, but so slight a sprinkle carried not force enough for it to be used often for that, and *baptidzo* in religious use took that meaning from pouring water. *Bapto* but rarely applies to washing.

4, That dip is derived from color, stain, a derivative from a derivative, which is very common in all languages.

5. That in Christ's day, and later, Origen, Irenæus, born four years before John died, Hippolytus, and all the learned translators translate *bapto*, sprinkle—this sustained by the hundreds of thousands of the church, the unanimous verdict. Immersionists all insist that *bapto* and *baptidzo* are the same in meaning, only differ in one point, *bapto* means stain or dye they say. We have shown how it so means—its philology. Hence our position stands as firm as the everlasting hills.—
[*Time out.*

DR. GRAVES' FOURTEENTH SPEECH.

Argument from the Lexicons.

Advancing to my main argument, I will submit a few additional lexical authorities

34. Chas. Anthon (late President of Columbia College, N. Y., than whom, as a Greek scholar, no man on the American continent stood higher.

"*Baptidzo*. "The primary meaning of the word is to dip or immerse, and its secondary meanings, if it ever had any, all refer in some way or other to the same leading idea. SPRINKLING, etc., are entirely out of the question."

35. Trommius, (1718) Con. of Sept. "*Baptidzo*, to baptize, to immerse, to dip."

36. Vossius, (1648). "*Baptidzo*. To baptize signifies to plunge. It certainly, therefore, signifies more than "*epi polazein*," which is to swim lightly on the top, and less than "*dunein*," which is to sink to the bottom so as to be destroyed."

You will notice that this author pointedly denies the truth of my opponent's assertion, that baptized, in the sense of to immerse, is used to signify to drown, to destroy life, by all classic Greek writers. Schleusner, though suppressed, declares that it is never used in the sense of to drown, to destroy life, in the New Testament, though it is sometimes so used by the Greeks.

37. Pickering. "*Baptidzo*, to dip, immerse, submerge, plunge, sink, overwhelm; [these are his primary definitions; now follow his secondary, or figurative,] to steep; to soak; to wet; *mid.*, to wash one's self, or bathe; *oi bebaptismenoi*, soaked in wine, or drunken. *Plat. Symp.* 176, B; overwhelmed with debts, *Plat*; with questions, *Plat.*, *Euthyd.*; to overwhelm one with anything; to be prodigal toward one; to sink a ship or galley.—"Greek Lexicon."

38. Passow. "*Baptidzo*, *eintauchen*, *untertauchen*, to dip in, to dip under." [When Elder Ditzler read this author, he passed over these, and only read figurative meanings, and I now give these as Passow's primary ones].

39. Kouma. "*Baptidzo* to immerse, to dip repeatedly into a liquid.

40. Gaza. "*Baptidzo*, to dip repeatedly; hence, (i. e., by metonymy), used for to drench, to wash, to bathe."

You have noticed that Donegan and these two last give “to dip repeatedly” as one of the meanings of *baptidzo*. It was thought for a while that *zo* indicated a repetition of the action, but it is now given up. Liddell & Scott rejected it from their Lexicon, and Robinson says “frequentative in *form* but not in *fact*.”

I could give many others, but I have here presented more than was ever brought forward in a public discussion upon this continent, and all the principal ones I have with me. The mind that these forty of *the most authoritative* lexicons extant will not convince, would be as proof against four hundred. You will notice I have given their definitions in their own words, if in Latin, quoted the text, that you may decide if I translate properly. I have invariably given the primary and literal meanings, but my opponent gives, we know not what meaning of his authors, save we know he never gives the *literal* ones, and he gives their meanings in his own words, *seldom giving the text*. You will decide which of us treats this question fairly.

Another fact, every lexicographer of these forty, are Pedobaptist witnesses, not one a Baptist. I therefore submit my argument from the testimony of lexicographers to the public with all confidence. Let an unprejudiced world decide if my opponent has produced the thousandth part of the evidence for the definition *to sprinkle*, or *to pour* as the *proper* because *primary* meaning of *baptidzo*. I do, before God and this people, deny most conscientiously that he has produced any. He has not brought forward a standard lexicon of the Greek language, that gives *to sprinkle* or *to pour* as the primary, the literal or proper signification of *baptidzo*! If I am mistaken, let him correct me *here and now*—let him produce it, or give satisfactory evidence that it exists when he rises again. With the philological speculations of his crazy Furst I have nothing to do, but even Furst, if his full testimony could only be taken, will testify to the fact that to dip, to immerse, was the current use of *baptidzo* in the days of Christ and his apostles, even though he may claim that it meant to sprinkle a thousand years before, and this is all I want. This admission

is to be found somewhere in the writings of Olinthus Gregory. "Touching the action of baptism, it is one question where the proof is all on the side of the Baptists." Must not every one who is not so unintentionally prejudiced that he cannot reason and feel the force of testimony, see that, thus far, the evidence is all on our side, that *baptidzo*, in its current literal signification in the days of Christ was to dip, to immerse?

Argument from the Invariable Practice of the Eastern or Greek Church.

This church grew out of the apostacy of the third and fourth centuries. Though the form of church polity was changed from a Democracy to an Episcopacy, the *action* of baptism was never changed by this so called church. From the fourth century until to-day by Canonical authority with which its office of Holy Baptism corresponds, immersion has been the undeviating practice, though early in its history it so corrupted the law as to institute three immersions for the one Christ appointed, and Tertullian on its first introduction declared that "*it was more than the Scriptures required.*"

I give here the Ritual of the Greek church.

Extract from Goar's "EUCHOLOGIAN, or Ritual of the Greeks."

"Office of the Holy IMMERSION (BAPTISM)."

(after the preliminary ceremonies)

"And when the whole body is anointed, the priest IMMERSSES (BAPTIZES) him [the child], holding him erect, and looking toward the east, saying:

The servant of God [*name*] is IMMERVED (BAPTIZED), in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; now and ever, and to ages of ages. Amen.

At each invocation, bringing him down, and bringing him up. And after the IMMERSING (BAPTIZING), the priest washes his hands, singing with the people: 'Happy they, whose sins are forgiven,' etc.

As Elder Ditzler has flatly denied that the Greek church in all its parts does invariably immerse and has invariably done so since the fourth century, now 1476 years, I will now quote a few of the many authors on this statement that concerns a plain matter of fact, that you may see who tries to mislead you touching a matter so patent to all.

DR. WHITBY.—"The observation of the Greek church is this, that He ascended out of the water, must first descend down into it."

DR. WALL.—“The Greek church in all the branches of it does still use immersion.” “All the Christians in Asia, all in Africa, and about one-third part of Europe, are of the last sort, in which third part of Europe are comprehended the Christians of Græcia, Thracia, Servia, Bulgaria, Rasoia, Wallachia, Moldavia, Russia, Nigra, and so on; and even the Muscovites, who, if coldness of the country will excuse, might plead for a dispensation with the most reason of any.”—*His. of Inf. Bap.*, part ii., c. ix.

DEYLINGIUS.—“The Greeks retain the rite of immersion to this day: as Jeremiah, the Patriarch of Constantinople, declares.”—*De Prudent. Pastoral*, pars iii. c. iii., § 26.

SCHUBERT.—“It is the opinion of the Greeks that the *true* baptism of Christ is administered, not by the application of water in any way, but by immersion, or by hiding the person to be baptized under water.”—*Instit. Theol. Polem.* pars ii. c. iii., § 12.

RUSSIAN CATECHISM.—“This they [the Greek church in Russia] hold to be a point *necessary*, that no part of the child be undipped in the water.”* —In Booth, on Bap., vol. ii. p. 414.

ALEXANDER DE STOURDZA, Russian State-Councillor, in a work published at Stuttgart in 1816, says: “The church of the West* has, then, departed from the example of Jesus Christ; she has obliterated the whole sublimity of the exterior sign:—in short, she commits an abuse of words and of ideas in practising *baptism* by *aspersion*, this very term being in itself a derisive contradiction. The verb BAPTIDZO, *immergo*, has in fact but one sole acceptation. It signifies, literally and always *to plunge*. Baptism and immersion are, therefore, identical; and to say, *baptism by aspersion*, is as if one should say, *immersion by aspersion*, or any other absurdity of the same nature.”—In Dr. Conant, on Bap., pp. 150, 151.

THE BISHOP OF THE CYCLADES, in 1837 published at Athens a book entitled, *The Orthodox Doctrine*. Speaking of sprinkling, he says: “Where has the Pope taken the practice from? Where has the Western church seen it adopted, that she declares it to be right? Has she learned it from the baptism of the Lord? Let Jordan bear witness, and first proclaim the immersions and the emersions. From the words of our Lord? Hear them aright. Disciple the nations; then baptize them. He says not, then anoint them, or sprinkle them; but he plainly commissions His apostles to baptize. The word *baptidzo* explained, means a veritable *dipping*, and in fact a *perfect dipping*. An object is baptized when it is completely concealed. This is the proper explanation of the word *baptidzo*. Did the Pope, then, learn it from the apostles, or from the word and the expression, or from the church in the splendor of her antiquity? Nowhere did such a practice prevail; nowhere can a Scriptural passage be found to afford shelter to the opinions of the Western church.”—In Bap., Mag., 1849.

PROF. STUART.—“The mode of baptism by immersion, the Oriental church has ALWAYS CONTINUED TO PRESERVE, EVEN DOWN TO THE PRESENT TIME.”

* Roman Catholic.

Now this is my argument from this authority. The scholars of this church, and it has had many distinguished ones in every century, such as Cyril, Beza, Chrysostom, Athanasius, Gregory, John of Damascus, Theophylact, Zonaras of the twelfth century, certainly understood their own mother tongue far better than any men who live in this age, and they could not have been in ignorance of the meaning of the simple verb *baptidzo*, that they used daily, not only concerning the common affairs of life, but in their sermons, religious instructions and church ritual. All the scholars and commentators and historians of this church from the fourth century to this day with one voice testify that to immerse or to dip is the primary and physical and *sole* sense of *baptidzo*. With this testimony we have seen the invariable practice of this church accords. Can a more conclusive argument possibly be framed? We submit it to the verdict of the Christian world.

Replication.

I must now defend the lexicons from my opponent's attack, and reply to some of his statements in his last speech.

1. He must remember that I alone have the right to lead the discussion in this proposition, and it is his duty to follow me, and reply to my arguments as I present them, and not to skyrocket all over creation the very first day. It was my plan to examine the Word of God on this subject first, and lexicons in their proper place. I have produced forty of the most reliable extant, and certainly *all the acknowledged standard lexicons*, and now he says I have put them out of all order, and I understand him to impeach the "whole array." But of the thirty-two, I read first, he mentions but seven in any way, and now let us see what he says.

He charges that I so read Stephanus and Scapula, as to make them say that *baptidzo* is to immerse things in water for the sake of dyeing. Possibly I did, for I was reading with great rapidity to get all my proof in. I will read more carefully, as I would have it go to record :

STEPHANUS.—"Baptidzo. Mergo, seu immergo, ut quæ tingendi aut abluendi gratia aquæ immergimus."

[To immerse, or dip in, as we immerse anything for the sake of dyeing or washing in water].

Mergo—*i. e.*, submergo, obruo aqua. [To immerse, *i. e.*, to submerge, to overwhelm in water.

Mark my opponent does not challenge the definitions of this great lexicographer, only objects to my reading so as to make *baptidzo* apply to dyeing. I do not so understand the author, but to say this, that it is just such an act as when we dip anything for the sake of dyeing it—it is usually taken out I believe—or into water to wash it—and the article in this case is taken out. Now, this is what Elder Ditzler emphatically denies, and has stoutly denied it in defiance of all authorities throughout this discussion. Stephanus, whatever others may think, says its action is like that of *bapto*—*i. e.*, like the act when we dip anything to dye. This witness is unharmed.

2. He says I made Scapula say dip in water for the sake of dyeing, and that I know *baptidzo* is not used for dyeing. Of course I do, and of course I know nothing is dyed by dipping it in water.

I will read again to let all see what I do understand Scapula to say.

SCAPULA.—“*Baptidzo, seu immergo. Item tingo; ut quod tingendi, aut abluendi gratia aqua immergimus. [To merse or immerse. Also to dip; as we immerse anything for the sake of dyeing or washing it in water,] item mergo, submergo, obruo aqua. [Also to immerse, to submerge, to overwhelm in water.] Baptismos et Baptisma. Mersio, Lotio, Ablutio, ipse immergendi, item lavendi seu abluendi actus. [Immersion, washing, washing clean; the act itself of immersing; also of washing, or washing clean.]*”

This great authority certainly talks sense, which I most heartily indorse and Elder Ditzler cannot gainsay, and this testimony with that of Stephanus decides this question in my favor, beyond controversy.

But Suidas, of the tenth century—I have never seen his lexicon, nor has Elder Ditzler—it is very rare—but I suppose Ingham, from whom I quoted, had seen it. Dr. Conant under Example 43, quotes this example of its use from Suidas’ lexicon, which certainly indicates what he understood it to mean, and that is immersion. “Desiring to swim through, they were

baptized by their full armor"—*i. e. submerged*. This example sustains Ingham.

Elder Ditzler's fling at immersionists is unbecoming in a gentleman, much more in a Christian. It is the utterance of a chafed spirit, overwhelmed with difficulties he cannot overcome, and Baptists can well afford to overlook it.

But Leigh; I make him say just the reverse of what he does say! Now this is a question of simple fact, and I assert most emphatically, that I have quoted Leigh correctly. I first copied from Ingham, and afterwards justified it by the text of Leigh, which I hold in my hand. I will read it.

"*Baptidzo*," omitting its derivation, "the native and proper signification of it is to dip, to dip into water, or to plunge under water." I appeal from Elder Ditzler's assertion to the decision of the scholars present, and scholars everywhere. It is your book, and if you will permit, I will copy the text, as it is in Latin for the reporter.

Will all observe that Leigh, speaking of the use of *baptidzo* in the New Testament, says of *baptismas*:

"If we are willing to observe the import of the word, the term of baptism signifies immersion into water, or the act itself of immersing and washing off. Therefore, from the very name and etymology of the word, it appears what would in the beginning be the custom of administering baptism, whilst we now have for baptism rather rhantism, that is sprinkling."

Can any one now doubt the correctness of the definition of *baptidzo*, in its classical sense, which I gave? *baptisma* being one of its noun forms?

He charges me with omitting "the whole New Testament definition of the phrase." I gave the whole *primary* definitions, which my opponent fails to do. I will show in my next speech that *baptidzo* has no different signification in the New Testament from its native, primary, classical sense, nor does Stephanus deny it. Therefore, I have in no sense misrepresented it.

He charges me with misquoting Schleusner, and making him say the reverse of what he does say, and of utterly perverting Stokius. I am glad that he has preferred this charge

against me, for I am still alive and here to defend myself. He makes the same charge in most offensive language against A. Campbell, who is dead and unable to defend himself. I will very soon enter upon my defense, and if my opponent is possessed of sensibilities not wholly unblunted, he will lay a troubled head on his pillow to-night, and regret that he ever made this charge against me.

Now for Rost & Palm. He admits their lexicon is a "great work." How have I perverted them? I gave the text not only of the primary, but *secondary* meanings of *baptidzo*, also. Is this evidence of unfairness on my part? These lexicographers GIVE TO DIP IN, OR TO DIP UNDER, OFTEN AND REPEATEDLY, AS THE PRIMARY MEANING OF BAPTIDZO! They give, it is true, to dip often, and as some do, thinking that *zo*, indicates a *frequentative* form, but this theory is given up. Liddell and Scott in their later editions have left it out, and Robinson says, "in form but not in *fact* frequentative"—to dip in or under then remains as the only *native, primary, real* signification of *baptidzo*. "*Dah*," therefore, consequently, indicates the *figurative*, as opposed to the literal use, by metonymy the *effect* put for the *act* or *cause* "to wet," "to moisten," "to over-pour," but to wet or to sprinkle are not therefore real definitions of the verb. Webster gives, "to choose by chance," and "to mortgage," under the verb to dip. But who will presume to say that they are the real, literal significations of the verb to dip? These are all the specific charges Elder Ditzler brings against the thirty-two lexicons I produced in my last speech, and what does he say "Hence, with these exposures, exposures! Mr. President, exposures! *These* exposures!! Has he made the shadow of one? He dare not say it here. But he seeks to make the impression upon his friends here and the public, by the *word*, that he has, without making the charge direct. But you know, and this audience knows, that he has made no other exposure here, save that his cause rests upon the remote and *figurative* use of *baptidzo*, as given by some lexicons, while you know that in enacting or construing the terms of a law, all figurative meanings should be discarded.

He concludes his assault by saying, "I challenge every one of Dr. Graves' lexicons." Well, I say, until he can impeach the lexicons produced, until he can demonstrate that the primary meanings that one and all give are all false, such a stupendous recklessness on the part of the Elder will, as it should effectually destroy all the confidence of mankind in him as a scholar and controversialist. What weight will his assertions have with thinking men after they read this?

Dr. George Campbell, that eminent scholar of England, was a Presbyterian, but he was an honest man. In lecturing his students, he warned them against the rash and reckless course of a man like my opponent, in these words:

"I have heard a disputant in defiance of etymology and use, maintain that the word *baptidzo* means more properly to sprinkle than to plunge, and in defiance of all antiquity [and I can now add of all Greek authors and lexicographers], that the former was the earliest and most general practice in baptizing. One who argues in this manner never fails with persons of knowledge to betray the cause he would defend, and though with respect to the vulgar, bold assertions generally succeed as well as arguments, and sometimes better; yet a candid mind will always disdain to take the help of falsehood, even in the support of truth."—*Lect. on Pul. El. p. 304.*

History of Liddell & Scott's Lexicon.

With respect to Liddell & Scott's Greek Lexicon, my opponent has certainly shown that he does not understand the history of that Lexicon, and I will endeavor to make that matter plain to him, and all men should know it. It was in 1848 or 1849 that Liddell and Scott, two of the most distinguished classical scholars of England, Episcopalians both, issued this work, a great work, and I will say *the most authoritative of all Greek lexicons ever published in the English language*. These men had the lexicons of all the most distinguished scholars who had ever written before them, and they took Eld. Ditzler's greatest lexicographer, Passow, as *their* foundation. About the fifth definition of *baptidzo* they had "to pour upon," and referred to the Greek author who so used it. I will here remark, the superiority of Liddell & Scott's lexicon consists in this: when they give a definition they give the name of a writer as authority for using a word in a given

sense, they at the same time append a quotation from his works containing the word as thus used. Prof. Drisler, of Columbia College, New York, brought out an American edition of this great lexicon. In the meantime, scholars in England and on the Continent examined this definition of *baptidzo* and the authority quoted for it, and remonstrated with Liddell & Scott for inserting it, and called their attention to the fact *that the authority cited did not at all sustain such a definition*. Convinced of the fact, they struck it out of their second edition as a definition unsupported by any Greek authority. Prof. Drisler, in the spirit of a true scholar, published a card informing the people that his second edition would be conformed to the second English edition, and “to pour upon” was struck out of his next edition. My opponent says Prof. Drisler was influenced by the Baptists and the Bible Union revisionists! How absurd the supposition! He disclaims any denominational influence in the matter. Prof. Duncan wrote to know why the American did not conform to the English edition. He was informed that it would be made to do so. Thus, the question we are discussing has been forever settled by Pedobaptist sprinklers themselves! The scholars of England, and Germany, and America have thus decided that “to sprinkle” or “to pour upon” is, in no sense, a definition of *baptidzo*. Mere controversialists may still contend, but all scholars have given it up. If “to pour upon” is one of the meanings of *baptidzo*, what motive could possibly have influenced the parties concerned to compromise their reputation as scholars by omitting to give this definition of it in their lexicon? Why, the facts show that, while they were so eager to foist this meaning upon the word, unhappily for them and the cause in which they were so zealous, there was not to be found within the whole range of Greek literature a single instance in which the word would bear this construction. The facts were against them, and they had to give it up. No scholar in England could find the coveted passage, and American scholars were equally unsuccessful in their search and at last had to abandon it in despair, and Prof. Drisler had to drop this pseudo interpretation from his definition of the word; and twenty years have passed, and the lexicon has passed through six editions, and all the Pedobap-

tist scholars of the civilized world have not been able to find any sufficient authority in the whole domain of Greek literature to justify them to give "to pour upon," much less "to sprinkle upon," as a proper meaning of *baptidzo*. They have given it up; and yet, in the face of all the facts, and in the face of all the scholars of both hemispheres, Eld. Ditzler stands up and has the modesty (?) to say that *baptidzo*, means "to sprinkle," and never "to immerse!" that its primary and native signification is "to sprinkle!" Will you take his bald word in preference to the established facts and the united testimony of all scholars of two hemispheres, and Pedobaptist scholars at that?

I will examine his construction of the 156 Example when he concludes his remarks, when I will sum up the evidence of those examples and show their bearing on his assertion, that *baptidzo* invariably in classic Greek, when referring to persons, means *to drown*.

Mr. President, he confesses that I am getting in earnest. I have indeed been in earnest from the first day of this discussion, for we are dealing with *earnest* matters. We are encouraging men, either to obey or disobey Christ. We are influencing their happiness here and hereafter. I am glad that he confesses that he is feeling my earnestness. He says, "it is time to do, or try to do, something." No one knows better than he that I have done something that has gone to record against him forever. I have proved, to the conviction of every unbiased mind in this audience, that his oft and boldly repeated, assertion that, "no instance can be found in Greek literature in which *baptidzo* was employed to express immersion of a living being without destroying its life," rests upon nothing but his unsupported authority. I have given him numerous examples that disprove his assertion.

Were the cavalymen of Xenætas, who were baptized in those pits of mud and water and thereby only disabled for the fight, destroyed? Were the men who were submerged with the ships on the sea of Galilee, and were dispatched by the missiles of the enemy as they arose to the surface, destroyed by the submerging act expressed by *baptidzo*? Was Aristobulus destroyed

the first time the ruffians dipped him in the swimming bath? If so, why did they continue to dip him? Was King Philip or the swimming master destroyed by the first dip they mutually gave each other, else how was it that they could play at the dipping game for an hour longer? Was the man of bad dreams destroyed by his plunge into the sea, which act is expressed by *baptidzo*? If so, how could he sit a whole day upon the shore after that immersion? Was Agamemnon destroyed by his immersion in lake Copais, for it is *baptidzo* used here? I have twice asked him if the king did not go to the Trojan war, but he will not answer. And while I have been doing this, I have shown that every example found in classic authors means primarily and literally "to dip," "to immerse," "to overwhelm," and I have done another thing, I have challenged Elder Ditzler now for four days to find a Greek author, or Greek lexicon, that gives "to sprinkle," or "to pour" as the *primary* and *literal* signification of *baptidzo*, and he has not done it, and his silence in his last speech is a complete surrender of both his boastful assertion and of his ability to sustain his "sprinkle;" and now his last speech, to every reflecting mind, is a conclusive confession of failure all along his line, as I will presently show, for these several matters I wish to notice here for the last time.

1. I wish to introduce an important witness to testify to the correctness of my canon, Dr. Geo. Campbell, President of Marischal College, England, a Presbyterian:

"The word *baptism*, both in sacred authors and in classical, signifies to dip, to plunge, to immerse. Had *baptidzo* been employed in the same sense of *raino*, to sprinkle (which as far as I know it never is, in any use, sacred or classical), *the expression would doubtless have been*, I N-DEED BAPTIZE WATER UPON YOU."

2. He says I have "given up the primary meaning." This information will astonish every one! I am, as you well know, Mr. President, rigidly adhering to the primary meaning, and by it grinding into the dust his position and assertions. But it is known to every scholar here that Eld. Ditzler never uses it. If he has read out here the primary meaning from one of the lexicons he has brought forward to sustain him, my ear

has not detected it. In every case he has given the secondary or figurative use of the word. Let this be remembered.

3. I want to call your attention to the fact that he frankly admitted this morning, that the Greek church has always immersed, as I have already proved to you. This is an important and weighty fact. The explanation is, the Greek is the language of the Greek church, and no amount of sophistry could induce them to sprinkle or pour upon, for Christian baptism. They have ever protested against the Latins as only *sprinkled*, and not *baptized* Christians.

4. As to Gaza, and Kouma, and some half a dozen other lexicographers and expositors of Greek classic usage, I have this to say, these men are not recognized as high *standard* authorities, but all they do say as to the primary meaning of *baptidzo*, is on the side of the Baptists, in favor of immersion as the real meaning.

5. Touching the argument from the ancient versions of the sacred Scriptures, as he is determined to anticipate me, I will say this, and it will serve to occupy his time until I get to versions, neither Origen, nor any translator of the Scriptures into any tongue, from the sixth century before Christ to the eighteenth after Christ ever, in one single case, translated *raino*, *rantizo*, *brecho*, or any Greek verb that means "to sprinkle" or "to pour upon" by *baptidzo* or its cognates, nor *baptidzo* by a verb whose primary signification is "to sprinkle" or "to pour upon." Let him find one example or be silent on versions, at least, until I reach them.

6. He has satisfied me, and I think he must have satisfied you, that he has given up the classic Greek, and that is a point gained to-day. I have all the classic Greek writers with me, and that is another point gained, and I have already shown that I have forty standard Greek lexicons with me, the definitions of not one of which did he challenge in his last speech. Forty standard lexicons give "to immerse," "to dip," etc., as the *primary*, true and real meaning of *baptidzo*, and he has not, and he will not, deny it. But he can find "to wet," "to moisten," given by several as the *secondary* meaning of *baptidzo*. Very well, what of it? Webster gives, as I have shown

you, "to wet," "to moisten," and even "to mortgage," as one of the secondary meanings of "to dip," but is there a child of fourteen who will claim that moistening a thing by sprinkling a few drops of water *upon* it is dipping the thing into water—that sprinkling, or mortgaging property is a definition of "to dip?" It is by this kind of strategy and *legerdmain* that my opponent gets "to moisten," "to wet," and then "to sprinkle," and "to pour," out of *baptidzo*. The Greek verb *baptidzo* no more properly means "to sprinkle" or "to pour" than the English verb *to dip* means "to sprinkle," as every Greek scholar in this house, and on this *continent*, *knows*.

7. But he says that he has immersed, and will immerse if necessary. I want to ask him a few questions. 1. Would he call it Christian baptism? 2. If so, by what authority in God's word would he immerse a person in the name of the Trinity, which, to say the least, means by its authority? 3. Is it or not by the only law—*i. e.*, the commission? Will he tell me the verse in the Bible that he will say authorizes him to immerse, or which he will admit contains a clear example of immersion? 4. When he immerses, does he or does he not put the subject "clean under the water?" and if the commission is his authority, is not *baptidzo* the verb that indicates the act? 5. Then will he tell us if those persons he immersed survived the operation? 6. If so, what becomes of his assertion, that *baptidzo* never puts one clean under the water, without resulting in death?!

8. But he says Mintert, and one or two others, perhaps, give *pluno*, "to wash," as a definition of *baptidzo*. Well, if *baptidzo* indeed means *pluno*, "to wash," it would not in the least help his practice of sprinkling, not in the least.

You can see why they give *pluno*, because it is necessary to dip into water when you wash. You ladies know that if your washerwoman were to sprinkle a few drops upon, or slightly moisten with a few fingers your clothes, and return them as washed, you would scarcely pay them.

Finally, I cannot please him. At one time he is against ancient authorities and pleads for modern scholarship, and when I bring up the modern he goes back and extols the old.

I cannot suit him. Almost all his morning's speech was on *baptidzo*, giving only the secondary and figurative meanings in his lexicons. Now, when I am pressing him to a fair and square issue on *baptidzo*, giving him and you the only proper signification of the term, because primary and literal, from forty standard lexicons, does he meet me? No; but it is now all *bapto*, a word never used in the Bible where there is reference to Christian baptism! His entire last speech was all *bapto*. Is this discussing the question, or an attempt to becloud and mislead you? But he shall not confuse or mislead any one unless he is determined, in spite of facts, to be misled.

I will state again, what my opponent will not stand up before me and deny, that *bapto* has nothing under the wide heavens to do with the determination of the true meaning of *baptidzo*, save incidentally, as the verb from which it is derived. Suppose I should grant for the sake of argument, that *bapto* means "to dye," and only "to dye," never "to dip," this would not affect the definition of *baptidzo*, the only word that Christ or the Holy Spirit used to designate the act of baptism. As derivatives sometimes lose the last shade of the signification of their primitives or root-origin, as *tingo* once primarily meant to dip, 2, to dye, now it has lost its first, and its secondary has become its primary, we are compelled to go to standard Latin authors and learn the signification they attach to it. Now, I have shown here, that throughout the New Testament only one signification can be given to *baptidzo* and the sense be preserved. I have shown that every Greek author whose works have reached us, use it only in the sense of "to dip," "to immerse," as the primary and usual signification, and in my last speech I quoted thirty-two standard Greek lexicons, and in this I have added nine more—forty in all, every one of which gives "to dip," to immerse," as the literal and proper signification of *baptidzo*, therefore this is the proper and current meaning of the verb, though my opponent could prove that *bapto* only means "to sprinkle."

But what is the fact touching *bapto*, which his entire last speech was an attempt to cover up? Its primary, native and literal signification is "to dip," "to dip into," just as certainly

as our English verb to dip means *to put one substance into another*; but secondarily it is used to denote the act of dyeing, because the thing dyed is dipped into the coloring matter, and hence, its secondary signification “to dye,” as every lexicon explains it, therefore, when, and only when, dyeing is alluded to, *bapto* may be properly rendered “to dye.” But mark and remember, the act of dyeing is never denoted by the verb *baptidzo*, never, nor is the Christian rite of baptism ever denoted by *bapto*—never; and what, therefore, does his speech for the last half hour amount to? If, indeed, *bapto* means “to dye,” that fact don’t help his cause one whit, for Christ never commanded his apostles to go out and dye the nations—color the people—and had he used the term *bapto*, wild as my opponent is, I hardly think he would claim that he was authorized to paint the adults and babies he baptizes in fancy colors, not unless he learned from the New Testament that the apostles painted for baptism. But Christ never used the term *bapto*. He claims that one grammarian, Kuhner, gives “tinge”—*i. e.* “to color slightly,” as the meaning of *bapto*, “and a host of others [other what, grammarians?] give ‘moisten’ as the primary meaning of *bapto*. He has left lexicographers now for grammarians, whose business is not with definitions, but the construction of language. What has he made by the change? Grant that Kuhner does give “to color slightly” as one of the meanings of *bapto*, this don’t help sprinkling, for the most devoted advocates don’t color slightly for baptism. But it is not true that a host of others, whether he means grammarians or lexicographers, give “to moisten” as the primary meaning of *bapto*. When he will present *one* standard lexicon or grammar that does so I will modify my emphatic denial. This is a plain issue—will he accept it?

So much, as a sufficient reply to all his speech. A poet may, by poetic license, declare that the lake was tinged, dyed, “colored,” by the blood of a single frog. Nobody is misled by it. A part of the lake, some part of the water was colored, and by a legitimate figure of speech, metonymy, a part is put for the whole, or the language may be simply denominated hyperbolic—an exaggerated description.—[*Time out.*]

DR. DITZLER'S FOURTEENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—Dr. Graves thinks he has one case where *baptidzo* puts a living being under water, who does not perish. Not yet, nor can he. “Bravely plunging (baptizing) himself into the lake Copais.” etc. Men often plunge into a lake, river, pond, creek, yet are not wholly submerged. Shakspeare says of Cæsar swimming in the river: “I plunge me in.” An orator describing the same says, “he plunged; the die is cast and Rome is free no more.” A horse “plunges” on land. It does not imply submersion. *Mergo* in Latin often occurs for plunge where the person swims—does not go under. I cited many cases in Louisville Debate, and need not repeat them. The same applies to Ex. 64 in Conant,

He says it would only be baptizing the water, if it was to pour or sprinkle. Indeed! Will he rely on that feeble effort that we supposed only children in debate could use? He says to sprinkle is “to scatter in drops.” If it is pour, it is the water you pour. Now we showed in our first address that the same words that mean to pour, to sprinkle, meant also in many cases, to moisten, to wet, others to sprinkle, then stain, color, others to pour, then to anoint, wash, cleanse—the vast majority of them coming also to mean dip, overwhelm, immerse, submerge. Over fifty such words we collected, and adduced a great number of them. The same words mean to sprinkle, pour, and to immerse. When they mean to immerse, do they not terminate on the person or object immersed? O yes. Well, in the same grammatical relation the same words stand to objects sprinkled, others moistened, made wet, stained, colored, all by affusion, yet the verbs took the direct accusative case in all such instances. The same verbs in many cases that mean sprinkle mean to stain, to wet, and surely to moisten, wet or stain is not to scatter in drops. In Greek nothing is more common than to say sprinkle a man—any

one—*ranein tina*, *rainein anthropon*, *rainein seanton*, sprinkle oneself, etc. David says, Ps. xli, 9, so it runs in Greek, *ran-teis* me; Latin, *adsparges* me; Syriac, *rusi*—all being “sprinkle me with hyssop.” So we constantly read in all languages—Heb. ix, 13, 19, 21—Moses sprinkled the book, people, tabernacle, and vessels of the ministry. Herodotus says, “the priests commanded the people entering the temples (*rantidzein heantous*) to sprinkle themselves with water.” Did they scatter themselves in drops? Did David and Moses and Paul so mean? Now the truth is, in the Hebrew there are sixteen to eighteen words all meaning at times to sprinkle; fourteen to sixteen in Greek meaning to sprinkle. Some few apply more to scattering dust, ashes, etc., and then to dispersions; others to blood and staining elements, and come more readily to mean color, dye; others apply to water, hence to moisten, wet, wash, overflow, overwhelm then immerse—*i. e.*, sink. Now our English word sprinkle has to stand for all these sprinklings. In some relations it answers to the disperse, scatter in drops of the Latin, Greek, Hebrew, in nine-tenths of cases our sprinkle has no such force, as Webster, Worcester, Richardson, etc, abundantly show. A lady sprinkles the floor, clothes—we ourselves, and it is perfect grammar in all languages, Semitic and Aryan.

I quote the *real* Webster, for since 1860 it is not Webster, they have changed it wholly. “Sprinkle, 1. to scatter, to disperse.” This is the sense Dr. Graves wants. Webster goes on “to be-sprinkle, as to sprinkle the earth with water; to sprinkle a floor, etc.”

Alex. Campbell, I think, began, that I must say, very silly argument,(?) but he never knew what philology was, however great or distinguished in some respects. Origen said “Elijah baptized the altar.” We know it was by pouring. He was the most learned Greek father that ever lived. Basil said he baptized the wood on the altar, the water was poured. David baptized the couch, the rain baptized the land, the woman baptized Christ’s feet—there is no ellipsis—it is distinctly clear. Is such a question as this, dividing the people so long and sadly, to be settled by such little, wholly untenable turns

or dodges? There are great issues involved. This question turns on great principles of language. The Bible Union, Conant, G. W. Eaton, etc., all held that "philological ground" is "the only ground admissible." So do Carson, Gale and Campbell. Yet Dr. Graves dodges it all, and would have you believe it is wholly irrelevant.

Again, the Doctor insists that the Greek church always baptized by immersion.

1. We proved in a former speech the contrary. He has not adduced any fact to support his assertion. Of late years many writers have visited the Greek church, and testify that they practice affusion and dipping both, but three dips always when they dip. They "dip repeatedly."

2. If it were so that they dipped none, what has that to do with apostolic practice? The Greeks are steeped in ignorance and debauchery to-day, and for centuries now have been. Their language to-day is vastly changed from its ancient form. Superstition reigns supreme among them. I go to ancient Greek, the Bible, and contemporaneous writers—not to the benighted ones, to-day known as the Greek church. How different the Jewish, Roman Catholic and Greek rites from those of 1800 years ago! All the Greek church baptizes infants. Do you accept that?

3. We showed that in the Greek church, Latin church—in all the early churches—affusion was practiced.

4. Better than all, we showed that the apostolic age, and all previous ages, wholly practiced affusion. Dr. Graves says Kouma and Gazes did not write on classic Greek, but modern Greek. He should be better posted. They both wrote in modern Greek on ancient Greek. On *bapto* and *baptidzo* they make elaborate comments on citations from the earliest Greek classics—Aristophanes, Plato, etc., etc., as well as Homer, the earliest of all. Gazes' definition and comment on *baptidzo* is ten times as extended as Liddell and Scott's—his favorite, and on other words. It is based on Schneider's great German lexicon. It accords more with Passow, Rost and Palm than with any other extant, showing how excellent and accurate it is.

That *bapto* in the Septuagint never submerged an object—put it clear under the element, is fully explained by the way all the great folio lexicons, as well as the best Manuals define the Hebrew *tabhal*, of which *bapto* is a rendering in the instances cited. If it “merely touches the liquid”—“the object merely touches the liquid.” We will give a few texts and facts to show the truth of this, as *bapto* and *tabhal* often answer to each other.

These facts demonstrate

1. That *bal* always carries sprinkle as its fundamental signification.

2. It perfectly accords with the unvarying laws of universal language, as far as all Aryan and Semitic tongues go, with which alone we have to do.

3. We have also seen that the meaning *tabhal* has, cannot be derived from immerse as a primary meaning of *tabhal*. Indeed *tabhal* never means to immerse in the Bible. Not a place can be found. It does sometimes mean “to dip,” where the object is never enveloped in the liquid, but “merely touches it.” Dr. Brents said “if he could wield the power, he could dip an elephant in a spoonfull of blood.” Franklin, Tenn., Dec. '73.

4. In no instance was *tabhal* designed for mode, that not being essential, but in most cases a partial moistening. *e. g.*, (1) Ex. xii, 22, a branch of hyssop saturated with lamb's blood. (2) Lev. iv, 6. (3) 17, the priest moistens his fingers with blood. *Bapsei apo ton aimatos*, not in, but by means of the blood. (4) Lev. xiv, 6: “As for the living bird, he shall take it, and the cedar wood, and the scarlet, and the hyssop, and shall dip them and the living bird in the blood of the bird *that was killed over the running water.*” (5) Lev. xiv, 49-53: “And he shall take to cleanse the house two birds, and cedar wood, and scarlet, and hyssop:

“And he shall kill the one of the birds in an earthen vessel over running water:

“And he shall take the cedar wood, and the hyssop, and scarlet, and living bird, and dip them in the blood of the slain

bird, and in the running water, and sprinkle the house seven times." Dip them, (*tabhal*) baptize them with the blood, etc.

Immersion is out of the question here. The wings and head of the bird were not even moistened, as it had to be let go and fly off, (v. 53) and so kept free from the blood.

6. Gen. xxxvii, 31: "And they took Joseph's coat, and killed a kid of the goats, and dipped the coat in the blood:

"And they sent the coat of *many* colors, and they brought it to their father; and said, This have we found; know now whether it *be* thy son's coat or no.

"And he knew it, and said, *It is* my son's coat; an evil beast hath devoured him; Joseph is without doubt rent in pieces."

"And baptized the coat with blood"—the Hebrew reads,

1. The design was to make the father believe a wild beast had slain Joseph.

2. No beast would immerse all ones outer or inner coat slaying any one.

3. Jacob knew the coat of many colors. If of many colors, it was not immersed in blood, could not have been enveloped, submerged in it, but was sprinkled with blood. The Peshito renders it "sprinkled with blood." The Greek reads "stained." But Stephanus says, quoting it, that *primativi* the primitive meaning [of *molunein*—stain, here] is to sprinkle, —*conspergere*. V, 6233. Now, save in the case of Joseph's coat, the Greek of these is *bapto*, and never implies immersion, but a momentary, partial dip, where it is dip—as my finger in this drop of water here on the board. There was no immersion.

He asks me where it is that Origen, Irenæus and Hippolytus said *baptidzo* meant to sprinkle? I said they translated *bapto* to sprinkle, not naming *baptidzo*. The Doctor is a little hard of hearing, and a little confused. "Jordan is a hard road to travel" just now with him. Origen was the most scholarly, the best informed of all the fathers in all ages of the ancient church from apostolic times down. He translates *bapto* sprinkle—*errantismenon*. Irenæus, born before John died,

translates it sprinkle. (Against Heresies, ch. iv, ch. xx, 11), Hippolytus, a learned Archbishop, contemporary with Origen, writing A. D. 220, copies *bapto* in Rev. xxi, 13, then in the same verse translates it sprinkle. (Against Nœtus, ch. xv). Now all Baptists assert—A. Campbell asserts that *bapto* and *baptidzo* are exactly the same in meaning. Here then we have the three most learned and pious and pure Greeks of the second and opening of the third century, as well as all the oldest and best versions on earth, giving sprinkle for *bapto*. Did not these learned Greeks know their own language? And would lexicographers be faithful to their duty, if they failed to give such meanings? No sir! These lexicographers still follow, to a great extent, lexicons made by dippers, by parties dipped themselves, under statutory provisions for dipping in all cases, save where certificates testified, from the hands of physicians, that the parties were [infants] too delicate to be dipped. When the most learned of Greeks, like Aristotle, uses *bapto* for moisten, where by pressing or squeezing a juicy matter it oozes or spurts out on the hand, both moistening and (*anthidzo*) staining it. When, in the fifth century B. C., Hippocrates says of the coloring fluid, “when it drops (*epitaxe epi*) upon the garments, they are *baptai*”—stained, and Alcibiades uses it [born B. C. 400] for *asperse*, just as we do; when the most erudite Greek, born only 85 years after the death of John, translates it sprinkle—when the learned and cautious Irenæus, born before John died, bosom friend of John’s most distinguished disciple, Polycarp, when he, a native born Greek, wrote in Greek, translates it sprinkle. Then this learned Greek, Hippolytus, copies *bapto* in same age of Origen, and translates it sprinkle. Seven other of the best versions of the world do the same. Then ask yourselves what must have been the prejudice of these lexicographers—themselves dipped—under a law demanding dipping; and what the blinding prejudice of Sophocles, his late iron age, Greek lexicographer and immersionist, that they would not recognize these facts? Aye, even “baptized with tears,” they try to conceal by a shameful, disgraceful rendering, “*bathed in tears*;” as if Greek literature were not full of the fact that, if parties failed of baptism, it was held by all in that day, that their

falling tears, or poured out blood, baptizing them as it did, would be accepted as baptism. I think *bapto* is settled.

He says Leigh gives "overwhelm" for *baptidzo*. No, no. That is another author quoted by Leigh on the immersion side.

He says I omitted the first definition of Passow. Far from it. I read it out distinctly, and the second, also, as well as the next. The record will show that, in my first reply, I gave his first classic meaning—"immerse," then "submerge." He is excessively anxious to catch me in some mistake or blunder, or misquotation. We tell him now, you will never do it. Your partisans may report me as saying this or that—they may publish, as in Kentucky, Texas, Alabama, and elsewhere, often they have done, that I said this and that, but they knew it was untrue when they said so. We may err in judgment, as all men are liable; may make an unobserved slip of the tongue, as when men say Haman for Mordecai, or *vice versa*, but as to facts, quotations, etc., we make no mistakes.

But, if it not immerse, by what authority do we baptize by dipping? Under what meaning of the word do we "immerse?" We reply, we do not accept the dip—the act of immersion and emersion, as the baptism. It is the fact that water was element—brought into contact with them, that we recognize, not the mode of it. Were you so enveloped in impenetrable suits of clothes as that no water reached you at all, though dipped forty times and sunk—immeresed twenty feet deep for an hour we would not accept it as baptism. You were dipped you were immersed, truly, and in—yea, under water, but not baptized. You doubtless understand us now.

We tell the Doctor in sober earnestness, Ingham from whom he quotes, has left out, in a host of cases, the sprinkle and pour, of the lexicons, as we can prove, having them here before us. Not only that, but he mistranslates unintentionally, as I think A. Campbell also has done, on Stephanus, Scapula, etc. For example—this phrase under *baptidzo*—"as we immerse any thing in water (*aque*) for the purpose of dyeing or cleansing, etc., (*tingendi aut abluendi*.) Now 1. He makes *baptidzo* apply to dyeing, which it never does, as they all know.

2. He and Dr. Graves make these great scholars say things were immersed in water to dye or cleanse. Is it usual to immerse things in water (aqua) both to dye and to cleanse them? This is only one proof of a hundred of the carelessness and one-sidedness of immersionists. They are blinded by partisanship—good, clever people, but given over too much to one-sided views.

But Robinson (Ed.) has it immerse, he says. But you are anchored to the first meaning, and the first he gives is “dip in”—not out—spoken of ships, classic use. The record is “sink;” that is a correct rendering, but it will not suit you. “In the New Testament, to wash, to lave, cleanse by washing.” Then in a note, “ablution or affusion is the more general idea,” he says.

Stephanus gives “sink” and “overwhelm” as classic use; “wash,” “cleanse,” as New Testament use. That tells it all.

Dr. Graves asks the old question, If you gave a lady your handkerchief to wash it and she should just sprinkle a little water on it, would it be washed? How often I’ve heard that! Now, my good friend, we call your attention to this also as a striking additional evidence of the want of attention and study on the part of our good immersion friends. You thought there was argument in that; even Dr. Graves thought so. We hope to learn you to look at both sides more; not to be so easily led off into error. Suppose you had just dipped the handkerchief, would it be washed? Look now how easily duped you are! Suppose my face needs washing, your child, your carriage, floor, table, hundreds of things, how various the processes.

He quotes Ast for “cover over.” Now there it is again.—Ast wrote a lexicon only on the Greek of Plato, and *baptidzo* occurs only three times in Plato. In all three it is metaphorically used, and rendered “overwhelm” every time by Conant, A Cambell, and all other authorities, save such as render it intoxicate. Ast’s word is “*obruo*,” *ob* down, and *ruo*, to rush, fall, descend, a clear case of affusion as the basis of this metaphorical use.

Liddell and Scott's little school boy lexicon is brought up again, issued so late as 1849. Well, they were only eight years making it. The spare time from other duties devoted to it did not allow them but a moment or so to each word. On this point it is simply, as in almost all else, an abridgment and translation. What value is it when only a moment is spent in translating the word? Schleusner, Stokius, Suicer, etc., studied the occurrences of the word. This one goes no higher up for a literal meaning than Plutarch, years after Christ. His first meaning is "dip repeatedly!" Is that your practice? Where is his proof text for that? In Plato he renders it "overwhelm," as do others. Here is drench, wet, steep in this edition of Dr. Graves'; his author is crazy too, badly so. He renders it "draw water." Where has it that meaning? Nowhere at all. *Bapto* may mean that, never *baptidzo*. The silly—I ought to say dunce—makes a Greek smith dip into water "the red-hot steel" to temper it. You have seen smiths dip red-hot steel into cold water to temper it! That is under *bapto*. He says the learning of the world forced L. and S. to take "pour upon" out of his lexicon! It was Baptist intolerance, not learning. Why did the learning not force Passow, Rost and Palm to take "sprinkle, sprinkle upon, pour upon" out of theirs? It is used by all the great universities of Germany, all her great commentators, and critics, and professors! Why not compel Schleusner, Stokius, Suicer, Schaetgenius, Wolfius, Gazes, Koums, Schneider, Swarzius, etc., to take it out of their's as well as Wahl? Wahl did not have it in his first or second edition of 1829, but the learning of the world compelled him in the edition of 1831 to insert it. Why did not the learning of the world assail those old Greeks of learning, Origen, Irenæus, Hippolytus—those old translators of the apostolic age, and subsequently, to erase sprinkle from *bapto*? Why not force those great giants of intellect, Castell, Buxtorff, Schindler, who lived and toiled through musty foilos and cobwebbed alcoves through life, when they render *baptize* by sprinkle, pour, and words meaning pour, sprinkle by *baptize* in those languages? Yea, and if it "merely touches the liquid in part or in whole."

The truth is Liddell and Scott's lexicon is made to make

money out of its sales. It is for colleges and academies. Baptists would not patronize it if the offensive word "pour upon" was there. Our people, far from being so intolerant, paid no attention to it, as is usual with them. They forced the publishers in America even to erase "pour [water for washing]," which even his Ingham will tell him is in the English editions to day, under *louo*. As *louo* often interchanges with *baptidzo* Baptists could not tolerate that either. But Liddell and Scott have changed so often, all in a brief time, too, it is to be hoped they will get settled.

Now, gentlemen, where is my worthy opponent? He has attempted to break the force of my classic Greek demonstration; he utterly failed; he felt the force of my lexicons; he dashed against them gallantly; he fell back in disorder and confusion. Now, what can he do? His people feel the pressure, it is painfully severe to them. If ingenuity, or learning, and care, and study, and pains, with deepest anxiety, could do it, my distinguished and able opponent would do it; he would drive away the cloud and very midnight of gloom that spread over your cause.

But, sirs, what does Dr. Graves offer to meet the crushing weight of *facts* we have adduced—facts *his* authorities never noticed, never thought of, but which no scholar dare question? We treated *bapto* as we did *baptidzo*, tracing its earliest occurrences, doing the very thing that the great Freund, in Latin, and Liddell and Scott say is *the best* and only sure way in Greek, viz: making lexica of each writer's use of the word and all in chronologic order. We showed that its primary meaning was to sprinkle, moisten. What does he offer in reply to these facts? He repeats the old song that to dye, stain, is the effect of dipping. But we proved this to be wholly false. We gave facts. He has never touched those facts. He cannot. Let the attentive student examine the facts, *data*, etc., we presented in our twelfth speech. There they stand unanswered—unanswerable. But letting all of those facts pass, if stain, color, dye, be derived from dip, we will find it holding good in other words as well as *bapto*.

Let us take the leading Greek words that mean to stain,

color, besmear or smear, or dye, and see if it implies or comes from dipping, or favors affusion—application of the element to the object.

1. *Moluno*. (1) Liddell and Scott: to stain, sully, defile, to sprinkle;" Groves: *moluno*, to dye, stain, discolor, tinge, etc."

Stephanus quotes an authority endorsing it, that the "primitive meaning is to sprinkle," *conspergere*. Yet Dr. Graves tells us that it does not mean to sprinkle any more than *bapto*. That may be so as a whole, since both mean to sprinkle.

2. *Tengo*, L. & S., to wet, moisten, to bedew with, especially with tears, as *dakrusi*, to wash, to shed tears. *Ombros etengto*, a shower fell. To soften (properly by soaking, bathing, etc.) To dye, stain. Latin, *tingere*.

Groves: *tengo*, to moisten, wet, water, sprinkle, bedew, to soften, soak, steep, relax, to tinge, dye, stain color, etc.

3. *Palasso*, L. & S., "to besprinkle, stain," etc. *Paluno*, to sprinkle with flour, dust; to moisten. Groves, L. & S.

4. *Anthidzo*, L. & S., to strew with flowers, to deck as with flowers, and so to dye or stain with colors. Passive, to bloom, to be dyed or painted, sprinkled with white, browned.

Stephanus, *adspergo*, sprinkle.

Groves: to bud, blossom, etc., to strew with flowers, to color, tinge, dye.

5. *Chraino*, L. & S., to touch slightly. Hence, to smear, to paint, to besmear, annoint, to stain, spot, to defile.

Groves: To color, dye, stain, to smear, daub, paint, etc.

6. *Chrodzo*. L. & S., to touch the surface of the body; generally to touch, to impart by touching the surface, hence, to tinge, stain," etc.

Groves: to color, paint, tinge, dye, to stain, etc.

Chrotidzo, "to color, dye, tint,"—L. & S.

7. *MIAINO*, L. and S.—To paint over, to stain, dye, defile, soil. "Groves: To stain, dye, color; to polish, defile, etc."

8. *SPILOO*, L. and S.—To stain, soil. Groves: To spot, stain, blot, defile."

9. *DEVO Groves*: To wet, water, moisten, bedew, sprinkle; to tinge, dye, color, etc." See L. and S. and Pickering on also.

10. Take now *bapto*, "stain," "color," "dye." Liddell and Scott give it "color," "to *dye* the hair," "steep in crimson." "Groves gives it "dye, stain, color," as well as dip and "sprinkle," wet," "moisten, etc."

Now here are ten to thirteen words all meaning stain or dye, color. Take *bapto* out. No one will contend that every one of the other ten to twelve words ever means dip in any way, or immerse, not to say *primarily*. We see, then, in all these Greek words, stain, color, dye, come from primaries, where the application was almost exclusively by sprinkling, the other by *touching* with the element. *Anthidzo*, from strewing, sprinkling *flowers*, ornamenting thus, hence, to work flowers upon. Another word primarily meant "to touch the surface." The others meant to sprinkle, to bedew, moisten, anoint.

In Latin, in Hebrew, in Arabic, etc., the average of facts is about the same exactly. It is a case *demonstrated*.

1. That color, stain, dye, do not come from dip, first, because no word, primarily meaning to dip, means to dye, stain, color; second, all words meaning to stain, color, dye, come from words of sprinkling and touching.

2. That in all languages it is just the reverse, stain, color, dye, come from sprinkle.

3. *Bapto*, the root of *baptidzo*, means stain, color, dye, oftener than all things else. Hence, as dye, color, stain, NEVER comes from dip, immerse, *bapto* did not primarily mean to dip, but dip came from color, dye, while color, dye, came from stain; that from sprinkle, moisten, where the element sprinkled had coloring matter in it.

Now what is Dr. G's reply to all our facts? Why a bold ASSERTION! Not a text quoted—not a Greek authority cited!! Not only this, but so misquotes my language also. I gave Kuhner, who has never had an equal, gave Passow, in his critical knowledge of Greek, who, save THE PRIMARY meaning, as *he* understands it, of *bapto*, "to tinge," and Dr. G. adds—i. e., "to color slightly," as if *it* were K's explanation of his mean-

ing, when no such words occur, and no such language is in my explanation of it! Is not this bold? But he says he and others misquoted are grammarians! Only one or two were grammars—the rest all Lexicon's. But is not an author's explanation as good in a great original Greek grammar, at least as *Anthon's* is in a *private letter*? What turning and dodging here? He says "every Lexicon explains" *bapto* to *dye* as the effect of dipping. Now we defy him to find *any* one that does so, save the one made by Stephanus, who was an immersionist, in a reign of immersion, when almost all the people were dipped, both in France and England, and the abridgments made directly and indirectly from him, as was Scapula, etc.

But Dr. G. says these lexicographers are Pedobaptist witnesses, not one a Baptist. Are not Pedobaptists often rigid immersionists? *Every one of the first Lexicons made after the Greek was studied in the West, was by an immersionist.* Every one of the first Greek editors and annotaters was an immersionist. So late as 1549 not a Greek lexicon or grammar published in England or Scotland. The first Greek works published were the later, iron age Greek, and the editions very defective. They were Pedobaptists—baptizers of children, but dippers. A. Campbell truly says: "The English Protestant Church was a Baptist church for a considerable time. The first Protestant King, Edward VI, was immersed. The first Protestant Queen, Elizabeth, was immersed." Debate with Rice, 260. We quoted authorities on this before.

He quotes Anthon. We quoted him in our twelfth speech, and have Kuhner, Dalzel, a host of authors, all the native Greeks, the learned Greek Origen, who composed over *fifty* folio volumes; who was such a prodigy of learning, the King of Arabia sent for him to hear his wonderful learning; Hippolytus, Irenæus, and *the whole church* East, West, for 1500 years, rendering and endorsing the rendering *bapto* by to sprinkle. This is the root of *baptidzo*. Baptists all say it is the same in meaning with *baptidzo*.

Dr. Graves quotes Trommius as others on his side do. He never wrote a lexicon. It is a mere glossary by a Frosentine

whom *Anthon*, so eulogized by Dr. Graves, says was defective as a critic—giving the general opinion of scholars.

Vossius gives *sprinkle* as a New Testament meaning, and held that on Pentecost and other occasions, they were baptized by affusion. That shows what they meant by their definitions.

Pickering gives wash, cleanse as *the* New Testament uses—*literal*, not figurative uses. Dr. Graves leaves out his words “in the New Testament,” where Pickering shows it to be used as was *nipto*—a washing by pouring, and so evidently seen, that Geo. Campbell, Dr. Graves’s favorite, renders it “wash, by pouring a little water on their heads.” So does A. Campbell. Pickering makes *baptidzo* in the New Testament mean the same. Is not Mark vii. 3, a literal washing? Pickering refers to it as well as Wahl. Dr. Graves says Eld. Ditzler read Passow, and passed over *sintauchen*, *eintauchen*—immerse, submerge. We did not do so. We told the Doctor, who is hard of hearing, that we read it. But we paused and emphasized the words—“*Generally*, to sprinkle upon, to pour upon.” We were then on what was the prevailing and primary meaning, referring to his theory and sustaining our position. By the way, Webster’s late edition tells us, as I have said, that tracing the primary meaning and scientific inquiry into these facts, is a *recent* science—even mostly since Webster’s death; and the editors employ Germans to trace, to some extent, primary meanings, while *current* ones are as well given by Webster as can well be.

Dr. Graves leaves out both the *first* meanings of Gages and Kouma, and the “besprinkle” of the one, and the “pour upon” of the other.

He now tells us it was thought for a while that *zo*, in *baptidzo*, indicated a repetition of the action. Yes, but scholars found out fifty years ago, that it did not. Yet Donnegan, Liddell and Scott, etc., went blundering on, and held to the error, while Kuhner clearly showed it was wrong, as well as Stuart. In the same way Conant refutes Vossius who says *baptidzo* differs from *dunai*, to sink deep, where the object perishes. Now, Dr. Graves endorses this blunder in Vossius. Is it not astonishing? Dr. Conant adduces many instances where

dunai, *endunai*, *katadunai* occur, and are almost invariably the words used for immersion in the Greek church. Conant gives so many cases, we need not quote any. Did they immerse that the object might perish? What silly criticism? Also, *baptidzo* often applies to objects perishing, and Conant tells us so, and adduces many cases, and Dr. Graves gave us a few cases. Yet, now, he quotes Vossius, and forgets he is on record against it.

He quotes Scapula, and to evade the force of our exposures, Dr. Graves mistranslates the Latin in a way we never saw. *Ut quae tingendi aut abluendi gratia aqua immergimus*—which is as we immerse things in water for the purpose of wetting or cleansing them. Dr. Graves renders “as we immerse anything for the sake of dyeing or washing in water!!” He puts a comma (,) after “*aut*” where Scapula has none, perverts the Latin horridly, and makes Scapula say we immerse anything for the sake of washing in water!! A glance at the Latin will show a mere tyro how ridiculous is his dodge—unprecedented. But to hope to expose all his blunders is vain. A host of errors we leave over for our next reply. He perverts Schleusner utterly. He perverts Stokius as badly. We reserve to our next speech a full reply. We quoted them just as they are. He utterly misrepresents them. Not a fact has he met—not a point in philology has he attempted to meet, and he never will. Once more let us notice primaries.

That you may see how little men are settled on the primary meaning of *bapto* and *baptidzo*, we called your attention to the fact that they give us no rule, no law, by which to discover it. They differ evidently among themselves. Some give immerse first, some dip in, some dip repeatedly, some wash, or cover, some overwhelm. Some, like Wahl, and Liddell and Scott, change every new edition they make. Moses Stuart tells the uncertainty of it when he says of *bapto*—*BAP*—the root: “Immersing or plunging” is “*probably* the original” meaning. “I have supposed the original and literal meaning of the root *bap* to be that of dipping or plunging.”—p. 43.

We want something better—we have it. Meantime the whole weight of all their own great writers, ignored by Dr.

Graves, is, from the results exhibited, solid and unanswerable against the Doctor. Suffusion is the only Scriptural mode of baptism.

Dr. G. hates to give up the classic Greek. He says it is a rule that where *eis* is placed before the name of an element or object, that entrance from without to a point within, is indicated. That is not the case. The context must determine it. We put many cases in evidence where parties went *eis* towards the sea, *eis* TO the Jordon, met *eis* AT the Jordon, ship launched *eis* INTO the deep, but not UNDER the element, a ring placed *eis* on the hand, etc., etc. Why so boldly assert what is not correct.

The Doctor wholly mistakes me on *en* and dative of *where*, *wherein* in speech 13. His rule is simply not applicable. We never denied the where, or wherein, as he knows. We deny that when John said baptize *en* with fire, *en* with the spirit, that he alluded to *the place* WHERE they were to be baptized, but to *the instrumentality* WITH which—the element with which they were to be baptized. It was dative of *instrument*. Anoint *en* with oil. Wash thee *en* with water. He shall cleanse the house *en* hyssop, *en* the blood of a bird. We showed that 41 times consecutively thus *en* occurs. In one verse five times thus it occurs, where the word *sprinkle* in Greek and Hebrew occurs. Why does he not meet those cases? Why all this evasion?

He takes up the classics again. There is no proof of immersion. There is no proof that Agamemnon immersed. To plunge even proves not immersion as used by Dr. Graves. A man or horse plunges in water, yet goes not entirely under.—He “baptized *eis* at or in the sea.” If he had stood on its edge at its edge and baptized, *eis* was a most proper word to be used. Hence the citation proves nothing. The blister plaster or ancient pessary, made of verdegris, honey, and other elements had simply to be moistened with or in “the milk of a woman.” So the Greek reads *eis gala gunikos*. Who believes it was submerged in the milk of a woman? It was not the way or process. Kuhner’s grammar and all others completely sustain me, as he knows. He takes *one* use of *en* as if it were

every use—a most constant habit with Dr. Graves. Kuhner puts it *en at by*, where used *locally*—of *where*, etc. So does Passow, Liddell and Scott, and all authorities. Dr. Graves cites *en* as to *time*, *when*. What has it to do here? We have only to do with two uses of *en*. 1. Local use—in, at, by, near, etc. 2. Instrumentality—*with*, by means of—speak *en* with the voice, cleanse *en with* water, *en* with blood.

But remember that Matthew, Mark and John, as all scholars agree, use “Syricisms” constantly.

The great Walton, whose prolegomena is simply the store house of other scholars, says: “For the New Testament being written in Greek, whose *vernacular* language was Syriac, everywhere savors of Syrianisms.” Hence Ludovicus, author of a Syriac lexicon, etc., affirms that the true import of the phraseology of the New Testament can scarcely be learned except from the Syriac. They conceived *in* Syriac what they wrote in Greek.”—Modock’s Apo. to Peshito, 498, 499. So agree all eminent critics.

Now, in Hebrew and Syriac they *always* used the preposition for instrumentality in all these cases. Gesenius, immersionist, quotes *be* or *vhe* with *as*, the equivalent of *en*, *with*, and elaborately supports it, showing that the Greeks used *en* to correspond with the *be* of Hebrew and Syriac, etc. *Be* also often means *by*, *at*, *in*, *on*, of place. Hence the three writers whose style was Syriac, use *en* for *with*, as did the Septuagint translators also. But all agree *Luke* wrote often in pure *classic* Greek. Hence he NEVER uses *en* where the three who thought in Syriac but wrote in Greek (though Matthew *first* wrote in Syriac) say *en* in the cases cited—baptize *en with* water, with the Spirit. He simply has it *hudati* “with water,” *puri*, with fire, *pneumati*, with the spirit. This settles that matter. See Gesenius, Thesaurus and lexicon, under *be*., Furst, Uhlerman’s Syr. gram. etc.

And when I emphatically deny that *eis* primarily means *into*, I do what his dear Liddell and Scot, Passow, Rost & Palm, and all later and abler scholars do.

But he says I mistranslate and misunderstand Example 39 of Conant. Indeed. He renders it, “and already *becoming*

immersed (baptized) and wanting little of *sinking*, some of the parties at first attempted to leave, and get aboard of their own bark." Now Dr. Graves makes the absurd statement that the pirates, "were already becoming immersed," yet had not left the vessel! Now if they were on the vessel, as he admits, (and the text shows they were) how could they be "often immersed" *on the vessel*? But the text says—say it is the pirates he speaks of particularly, and that the ship was not about to be immersed, how could they be endangered and immersed on the vessel they had seized, if it was not about to sink? Where the danger they had to flee?

Verily the legs of the lame are unequal. But if it is only of the pirates, it is so much the worse, They were on the vessel. It was not sinking. Then it reads, "and being already baptized, and wanting but little of being *immersed*." Will he deny that *katadunai* means immerse here? Now if *baptidzo* immerses them, how could it be so in a vessel not about to sink? How could it be said they "wanted little of immersing"—being immersed, if already they were immersed? What ridiculous positions!

The ridiculous puerility of Dr. Graves' remarks scarcely deserves notice on Example 22. Because *baptidzo* applies to being drunk in Plato and Plutarch, does it imply that in all cases it is to make drunk? Because it means primarily to sprinkle, does it imply that, when it applies to a sinking ship? But Dr. Graves commits himself to the absurd position that *baptidzo* puts merely under the element, but *kataduni* sinks to the bottom! Now Conant not only tells him this is wholly untrue, but shows it by great numbers of examples.

1. *Baptidzo* in Josephus, Plutarch, etc., sends to the bottom every vessel or person it puts under, as well as in other Greek.

2. In the 4th century and onwards *katadunai* is constantly used where they baptized by immersion. Conant quotes too many cases to need citation. He will not deny it. Hence, Dr. Graves' whole theory, all he says, as a whole, EVERYTHING he says is just so much error unsupported. He has dragged out all the old errors and blunders of all past writers, and

now is head and ears swamped in the cumbrous mass. He discriminates not between the good and the bad, the hughest blunders and the most accurate criticisms. What progress can be made where a drag-net is to pull all the old blunders, now abandoned by all sides, into prominence again?

He says I define *aei* "now," by all the time. I did so from the first, always, all the time. He pretends that I say of Example 16, pressing him to the bottom and holding him there. Does his cause need such misquotations? Or is he getting witty, or has he rubbed up against Ewing? He would render *aei* on the authority of scholars "frequently." Yes, old immersionist dreamers of the very dawn of the revival of learning, and largely these are his "scholars," and these old immersionists are his Pedobaptists generally.

Into everlasting life—a compound always of this word means "*frequent*" life, frequent punishment instead of always continuous! Thus he says anything, drives anyway, steers to any port to get out of the pelting storm. Alas, it still pours on.—The oil is not the means with which the tow was baptized, he informs us now, but points out *the place where* the baptism took place? *Wherein, where, case!!* And the proof is he baptized the tow *elaio* with oil. So the Greek reads. But Dr. Graves is so full of jokes that he wishes to relieve the debate of seriousness. To complete this he makes the smiths plunge a "*mass of red hot iron drawn from the furnaces*" into water to temper it.

His case where Philip baptizes is not *baptidzo* but *diabaptidzo*, and not in point. See my 13th speech, pages 295-6. It is useless to repeat. It was not a case of dipping.

Finally, waxing desperate, stung to blindness, the Doctor quotes *bapto* for *baptidzo* where Aristophanes has it wash the wool—he renders the *baptousi* wash, by dip, and puts it *baptidze sthai* and repeats the blunder, professing to quote Cowart, 79, "dipped in dye," *baptisthan en bammati*. Now *baptidzo* NEVER applies to dye, nor puts an object in *bammati* dye. If the Dr. will just *think* or *look*, he'll see his blunders here. But to expose them all is a job to weary Hercules. Classic *baptidzo* never *dips*. Whenever it puts living beings under the element,

they perish. On the baptism of Benaiah he quotes "all the little particles of hail" with which the Jew baptized, as if it said "breaking all the ice," as if to immerse. There is no ice, but the "little particles of hail." We gave the amount of water with which such a Jew baptized. One-fifth of a pint sufficed. Less than a man would drink, sufficed, as a case of that kind occurred.

The Clemens Alexandrinus case he touches lightly also. He renders "sprinkled herself with water," bathed. I do not object. It shows *how* they bathed. The Greek is *raino*, which so often Dr. G. tells us is the Greek for sprinkle, and *hudor* water. If he prefers bathe where it is "*sprinkles with water*," all right. You will know what *bathed* means hereafter, when he renders baptidzo bathed, *amad*, "bath"—it is "sprinkle with water." He insists baptize on the couch is to "bathe after sleeping." Not a word of it. 1. He cites Homer twice where the parties wash—one at the hoary sea, the other before prayer, "sprinkles herself with water." Now it is of this kind of baptism he speaks. Ancient writers allude to this custom. Hervetus says of this case :

HERVETUS: "The Jews washed themselves not only at sacrifices, but also at *feasts*, and this is the reason why Clement says that they were purified or washed upon a couch," *i. e.*, a dining couch or triclinium. To this Mark refers ch. vii, and Matt. xv, 2. Turtullian refers to it when he says, "Judæus Israel quotodie lavat. The Jewish Israel washes every day."

The "Apostolic Const.," 66, alluding to a Jew says, "Unless they baptize themselves daily they do not eat; still further, unless they purify (*kabaroosin*) with water their *couches*, and plates, and cups, and goblets, and seats, they will not use them at all."

Thus we see all the facts stand out in support of affusion.

But Clement makes "washing the hands at the hoary sea," and "sprinkling with water," to be images of the baptism enjoined by Moses. Nay, it was handed down "by the poets from Moses." This, then, was the baptism from Moses handed down—to wash the hands to sprinkle with water.—[*Time out.*

DR. GRAVES' FIFTEENTH SPEECH.

MR. PRESIDENT.—He says he has proved that the Greek church does not always baptize by immersion! I will say this for my opponent, and he will doubtless regard it as a compliment, that he has done what no living man before him ever did, and what no man living besides him would do, having a proper regard for his own reputation, viz., deny that the Greek church always immerses for baptism. No fact is better known, whatever other rites they may add to this one, every scholar knows that they consider the immersion as the baptismal act.

4. I do not deny that affusion was practiced in the Latin church for baptism, but I do most emphatically deny that it ever was in the Greek church. The Latin church, in cases of necessity, sprinkled, but it never held or taught that aspersion was the apostolic practice.

5. My opponent mistakes with reference to a clear matter of fact when he represents me as saying, that Kouma and Gaze did not write *on* classic Greek. I never used any such expression at all, but I did say that they wrote *in* modern Greek, were commentators rather than lexicographers, and of light authority.

What I have to say about the Hebrew *tabal*, will be said when I come to versions, and it will be found altogether against his case.

He was off on *bapto* again, a word never used for baptism, for nearly one half of his last speech. It is very well, when he has nothing else to say, he can discourse on that. Because, secondarily, it means "to dye," "tinge," since dyeing is done by immersion, and that is as near as he has got to making out his "sprinkle" from *baptidzo*. Mark one thing, he has not yet produced a standard lexicon that gives "to sprinkle" or "to pour" as the literal, current definition of either *bapto* or *bap-*

tidzo, much less "to moisten," or "wet in any way." I have repeatedly challenged him to do so, and he has not, and I again challenge him to the task. If his assertions are true, why don't he produce some show of authority to sustain them.

8. Sophocles is regarded as a lexicon of standard authority by American and German scholars, and he says that *baptidzo* never did mean anything different from "to dip," "to immerse," and he has critically examined the entire period from one hundred and ten years before Christ to eleven hundred years after Christ. I assert again, that wherever *bapto* is used to denote "to dye," it is used in its secondary signification, and "to sprinkle" is no more a proper signification of it than it is of our English verb to *dip*. This is the way that all lexicographers and critics have settled it, and Eld. Ditzler, nor Dale, nor any other man can unsettle it. I shall refer to *bapto* no more in this debate.

9. He shall not mislead you with respect to Leigh. He brought him forward as an important witness on his side, and I have shown that his testimony is all against him. I will soon give his testimony in full as to the proper meaning and New Testament use of *baptidzo*.

10. The reporter's notes show that when you brought forward Passow, you did not give the primary meaning until I called upon you to do it.

11. I know not what my opponent means by my "partizans in Kentucky, Texas, and Alabama, and elsewhere" misrepresenting him. I have no partizans, nor do I believe that a Baptist in these States has ever misrepresented my opponent's positions. As editor I see all they have said through the press, and I am certain he has repeated in this debate every strange thing charged upon him.

You have heard how he has used Schleusner in support of his position, that *baptidzo*, while it sometimes is used in the sense of "to dip," "to immerse," in classic Greek, *yet it is never used in this sense in the New Testament!* and he even advises me, when I want to know what Schleusner does say, to go to his book (the Ditzler-Wilkes Debate); that he and his friend made that book to instruct the people. Now, I happen to

have Schleusner in my hand, as well as Eld. Ditzler's "book," and I wish to show you the kind of instruction that I find in it. I have said, that intentionally or through ignorance, he has, by suppressing a very important part of a sentence, made Schleusner say what he does not say, and what he never intended to say—he has suppressed his testimony, and put a lie in his lips

I will place before you what Eld. Ditzler makes him say, and then what Schleusner really does say, and leave you to decide if my opponent's translation and representations of his authors should be implicitly relied upon. I quote from the speech of Eld. Ditzler in the Debate, pp. 487, 488 :

"*Baptidzo*. 1. *Proprie: immerso ac intingo, in aquam mergo, a bapto* * * * IN HOC AUTEM SIGNIFICATIONE NUNQUAM IN N. T. sed eo frequentius in Scriptt. Gr. legitur, v. c. Doid. Sic. 1. c. 36, de Nilo exeundante* * Strabo, Lib. xii. 391, etc., etc. Jam, quia haud raro aliquid immergi ac intingi in aquam solet, ut lavetur, hinc 2. *abluo, lavo, aqua purgo* notat. Sic legitur in N. T. Marc. vii. 4, *kai apo agoras ean me baptizontai* (in quibusdam codd. *rantizontai*), *ouk esthionsi* et res, in foro coemtis, nisi prius aqua abutæ et purgatæ fuerint, non edunt. Luk. xi. 38 * * *ebaptisthe* * * *lavasse. Baptizesthai* non solum *lavare*, sed etiam *se lavare* significare, multis locis probare potest. 3 Hinc transferetur ad *baptismi ritum solemnem*, etc. 4. Metaphorics: ut Lat. *imbuo, large et copiose do, atque suppedito largiter profundo*."

"*Baptidzo*. 1. Properly: to immerse or to dip, to plunge into water, from *bapto* * * BUT IN THIS SENSE IT NEVER OCCURS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, but in it frequently in (classic) Greek writers, for example, Diodorus Siculus 1, ch. 36, used of the overflow of the Nile, in Strabo, etc., etc. Now because not rarely (not unfrequently) a thing is accustomed to be immersed or dipped in water, that it may be cleansed, hence, 2. it means *to cleanse, to wash* (i. e., in any way that will cleanse), *to purify* WITH water. Thus (in *this* sense) it occurs in the New Testament. Mark vii. 4, and (having come) from the public place, they will not eat unless first they baptize themselves (Latin of S.); and things purchased in the market they will not eat, unless first cleansed and purified with water. In many texts it is *rantizontai, sprinkle* (i. e., for baptized). Luke xi. 38 * * *baptized* —*wash, baptizesthai*) to baptize, not only means to *wash* but also to *wash one's self*, as can be proved in many places. 3. Hence, it is transferred to the solemn rite of baptism, etc. 4. Metaphorically: as (i. e., equivalent to) the Latin *to imbue*, to give and administer to (any one) largely, TO POUR FORTH abundantly."

As I have nothing more to say on *bapto*, I will now meet his charge that I have perverted Schleusner and Stokius, and show you who is the guilty party, and guilty beyond precedent.

These are the remarks and the use he has made of his own perversion of his author :

"Now, while Schleusner gives immerse and dip, he takes care to say it never occurs in this sense in the New Testament. But they leave that out. Here Schleusner, whom Campbell holds up as one of the best lexicographers in the world, defines *baptidzo*, as a classic word, by immerse, and gives a number of references, such as the submergence of land by water, immersion of animals, people, etc., and then says *it never has this signification in the New Testament*. They leave that out; it defeats their ends."—Debate, p. 488.

Now, this is as it stands in Schleusner's Lexicon, under *baptidzo*, with the sentence that Elder Ditzler suppresses.

"*Baptidzo*. 1. Proprie: immergo ac intingo in aquam mergo, a *bapto*, et respondet Hebraico *taval*. 2. Reg. v. 14, in vers. Alex. et *tava* apud Symmachum Psalm lxviii. 5, et apud *incertum*, Ps. ix. 6. In hoc significatione nunquam in N. T. sed eo frequentius in Scripitt. Gr. legitur. v. c., Diod. Sic 1, ch. 36 de Nilo exundante (toon chersaioon therioon ta palla hupo ton potomon peri lephthenta dia phtheiretai baptizomena)"—Gr.

Which he renders into Latin :

"Multa terrestrium animalium a flumine deprehensus submersione periunt."

Which I translate :

Properly: to *plunge into*, and *dip in*, to *sink into water* from *bapto* and corresponds to the Hebrew *taval*, 2 Kings v. 14, in the Alexandrian version [the Septuagint], to *tava* in Symmachus Psalm lxviii. 5, and in an unknown writer in Psalm ix. 6. In this signification it is never used in the New Testament, but frequently in Greek writers, for example V. C. Diod. Sic. 1. c. 36, concerning the overflow of the Nile. Many land animals, overtaken by the river, perish by the submersion.

After quoting from Strabo to the same end, Schleusner says :

"Jam quia haud raro aliquid immergi ac intingi in aquam solet, ut lavetur, hinc. 2) Abluo, lavo, aqua, purgo notat."

Which I translate literally :

"Now, because not unfrequently anything is accustomed to be immersed and dipped into water that it may be washed. 2) [secondarily, *i. e.*, by consequence] it denotes *to wash*, *to bathe*, to cleanse in water," [of course when it is done by immersion].

What then does Schleusner really say when permitted to tell the whole truth? He declares that the proper signification of *baptidzo* is *to immerse*, *to dip into*, *to sink in water*, and that it corresponds to the Hebrew verb, *taval*, in 2 Kings, v.

14, (where Naaman *tavalized*, dipped himself in Jordan seven times), and that it also corresponds to *tava* in Psalm lxviii. 5, "thou hast overwhelmed, (*i. e.*, *destroyed* by an overwhelming) cities," and in an unknown writer, a gloss on, Ps. ix. 6, "their memorial is *perished*," (by an overwhelming that covers it out of sight.) But "in *this* sense, it is never used in the New Testament." In what sense? Unquestionably the latter, as *tava* is used in those two passages referred to. In what sense is *tava* used in those two passages? In the sense of such an immersion or overwhelming as results in causing the subject to perish. In the sense, then, of to destroy by immersing it is never used in the New Testament, but is often, not always so used by Greek writers.

Here we have this distinguished biblical scholar and critic, (Dr. S.), positively and emphatically denying the assertion of Eld. Ditzler that "wherever *baptidzo* is used to put a living being *clear under* the water, it destroys." Is not this quite different from what Eld. Ditzler makes Schleusner say, that *baptidzo* is never used in the New Testament in its proper sense—*i. e.*, to immerse, to dip? With what language should this use of authorities be reprimanded? Must he not confess that either he did not understand this author, or that he intentionally suppressed an important part of his testimony? Then he emphatically affirms that S. declares that "*baptidzo* came to mean to wash, to cleanse," etc., in any way, "and in this sense it occurs in the New Testament." It is painful to notice this, but fidelity to the truth compels me to say that these are Eld. Ditzler's own words, which he puts into his translation, and quotes them as S.'s! Schleusner does not say it, or anything like it. See his text.

My eye rests upon another misleading translation in his book of instruction, which, though he has not so used it in this debate, he may, and I notice it here; and the more particular am I in noticing these matters as I am contributing these efforts to make a book for the instruction of the people who cannot read Latin and Greek. In the seventh line from the bottom, p. 488, he makes Schleusner say:

'In many texts it is *rantisoni*, sprinkle, for baptized.'

Schluesner does not say *many*. Here is what he says: "Sic legitur in Novo Testamento, Marc. vii. 4, kai apoagoras ean baptizonti (in quibusdam codd, *rantisoenti*) ouk esthiousi.

Which he renders:

"And things, bought in market, unless they first immerse, (in certain texts it is sprinkle) they eat not."

Now he makes Schleusner say in many texts is *rantizonti* instead of *baptizonti*, while he only says that in certain texts, they are *few*—two, perhaps, accredited ones, not the oldest—in which the copyists have substituted *rantizonti*, to *sprinkle*, and why this change if *baptizonti* ever means to sprinkle, why the change? Why those copyists corrected the text to teach their own views they believed, they sprinkled themselves, but they knew that there was no sprinkle in *baptizonti*, so they dropped it, and substituted *rantizonti*, and this is a strong proof that *baptidzo* only means to immerse. But why does Eld. Ditzler translate it *many* texts? Was it not to impress you, that with ancient writers *baptidzo* and *raino* are synonymous terms? He that is unfaithful in little things may be expected to be in weightier matters.

But how does he permit Schleusner to testify concerning *baptisma*, the only noun form of the verb used in the New Testament to denote the rite of baptism? We may expect to learn what Schleusner understood the meaning of this term is in the New Testament.

Eld. D. entirely suppresses the definitions of *baptisma*, save the English word, "baptism," when Schleusner gives *immersio* immersion, as its first and only proper meaning! and baptism not as the first or proper meaning at all! but he gives those of *baptismos* at length, in order to making the impression that this is the more important word, and that it signifies a washing or wetting *by any mode*. Now here is what Schleusner says of *baptisma*, the noun used when the Christian rite is referred to:

"*Baptisma* Nomen verbale a perfecto passivo *bebaptisma* verbi *baptidzo*. (1) proprie: *immersio, intinctio in aquam, lotio*. Hinc transfertur 2) ad ritum sacrum qui, *kata exomen*, baptismus dicitur, quo baptizandi olim in aquam immergebantur, ut veræ religioni divinæ obstringerentur."

Which I translate:

'*Baptisma* is a verbal noun from the perfect passive of the verb *baptidzo*.

1. Properly, immersion, a dipping into water, a bathing. Hence it is transferred 2. To the sacred rite which, pre-eminently, is called baptism, and in which formerly they were immersed in water, that they might be obligated to the true divine religion."

All can by this see that from the beginning to the end, Schleusner has been perverted by Elder Ditzler, to teach what he never said, and contrary to what he did say. I appeal to every scholar present, here are the books, and to every scholar on the continent, [passes them over to scholars, and to Dr. Talbert]. Such a course with an author is as unwarranted, as I believe, it is unprecedented in its grossness and flagrancy. If he has treated one lexicon thus, before our eyes, what have we not a right to expect of the many from which he has quoted here that we have not the opportunity to examine? I do therefore, as I am amply justified in doing, challenge every authority he quotes in this discussion, the full text of which he does not submit for examination. I cannot take what my opponent avers an author says, nor his translations, unless he submits the text of the author.

Is the Greek of the New Testament unlike Classic Greek.

My opponent and a few other controversialists, claim, as a last argument, that the Greek of the New Testament is unlike classic Greek or any other Greek extant! Well, what next? Such a statement argues a desperate cause. When I declared in my opening speech that there were some men who would do it, but if an angel from heaven should say so in your hearing, let him be rejected by you as a false teacher and deceiver. I did not know that my opponent would take this position! Grant it to be true, what follows? why, as I then indicated that the New Testament was not a revelation to the Greek nations in apostolic times! It has ever been, and is, a sealed book to all the living nations of this day, and will ever remain so, until the Holy Spirit gives us an inspired lexicon by which to interpret it. If Eld. Ditzler be true, then there is nothing in the New Testament obligatory upon us. His position releases us, from all obligations to read or to obey the New Testament. Surely that must be a desperate cause, that forces its advocates to take such a reckless position.

I will submit a few standard authorities upon this point, and if my opponent sees fit to close in with me on this issue, I am prepared for the contest, and will force him to deny the binding authority of the New Testament upon the world.

1. I appeal to the vi. Rule of interpreting the New Testament, which, at the outstart, my opponent accepted. It is of pointed force here.

"VI. The principles of interpretation are common to sacred and ordinary writings, and the Scriptures are to be investigated by the same rules as other books."

2. MOSES STUART, in his comment upon this, says with great force:

"If the sacred Scriptures be a *revelation* to men, then are they to be read and understood by men. If the same laws of language are not observed in this revelation as are common to men, then they have no guide to the right understanding of the Scriptures, and our interpreter needs inspiration as much as the original writer. It follows, of course, that the sacred Scriptures would be no revelation in themselves, nor of any use, except to those who are inspired. But such a book the sacred Scriptures are not, and nothing is more evident than that when *God has spoken to men, he has spoken in the language of men, for he has spoken by men and for men.*"

Lexicons of New Testament Greek.

3. Wahl's Clavis of the New Testament (1829 Leipsic), which Eld. Ditzler endorses as "one of the most excellent we have," therefore I give all his meanings of *baptidzo* and its derivatives.

"*Baptidzo*, f. iso. (*a baptō*, *mergo*; *sæpius mergo*, in New Test:) 1. *immergo* (universe—Jos. Ant., ix, 10, 2; xv. 3, 3. Polyb. i. 51, 6,) (*a*) *proprie et quidem de immersione sacra.*' (*From baptō, to immerse; often to immerse, in the New Testament.*) First, *to immerse*, (*always in Jos. Ant., 9, 10, 2; and 16, 3, 3. Polyb. i. 51, 6.*) (*a*) *properly and truly concerning sacred immersion.*"

Can any testimony be more explicit and conclusive that *baptidzo* means "to immerse," and only "to immerse," in the New Testament?

4. I call attention to Prof. Sophocles's Greek lexicon of classic and New Testament Greek, which covers a period of one hundred and ten years before Christ to the year 1100 after.

"*Baptidzo*, to dip, to immerse; sink, to be drowned (as the effect of sinking); to sink. Trop., to afflict; *soaked in liquor; to be DRUNK, INTOX-*

ICATED. 2. Mid., to perform ablution ; to bathe ; *baptizesthai teis darkrasi* ; *bathed in tears* ; to plunge a knife. 4. Baptidzo, mergo, mergito, tingo, (or tinguo) ; to baptize—New Testament everywhere. There is no evidence that Luke and Paul and the other writers of the New Testament put upon this verb meanings not recognized by the Greeks."

5. Ed. Robinson, in his lexicon of the New Testament, gives no example of *baptidzo* being used in a sense differing from its classic meaning, "to dip," "to immerse."

6. Analytical Greek Lexicon, Bagster & Sons, London.

"*Baptidzo*, fut. *iso* aor, 1, *ebaptisa*, properly to dip, to immerse : 2, to cleanse or purify by washing ; to administer the rite of baptism, to baptize."

"*Baptisma*, atos, to, pr. immersion ; baptism, ordinance of baptism.

"*Baptismos*, pr. an act of dipping or immersing."

7. Dr. Geo. Campbell, President of Marischal College, Presbyterian, says :

DR. G. CAMPBELL.—The word *baptizein*, both in sacred authors and in classical, signifies to dip, to plunge, to immerse ; and was rendered by Tertullian, the oldest of the La. Fathers, *tingere*, the term used for dyeing cloth, which was by immersion. It is always construed suitably to this meaning." (Note on Matt. iii, 11). "I should think the word '*immersion*,' (which though of Latin origin is an English noun, (a better English name than baptism were we now at liberty to make choice.—On the *Gospels*, vol. ii., p. 23.

'I have heard a disputant, in defiance of etymology and use, maintain that the word, rendered in the New Testament *baptize*, means more properly to *sprinkle* than to plunge ; and in defiance of all antiquity, that the former method was the earliest, and for many centuries the most general practice in baptizing. One who argues in this manner never fails, with persons of knowledge, to betray the cause he would defend ; and though, with respect to the vulgar, bold assertions generally succeed as well as arguments, sometimes better, yet a candid mind will disdain to take the help of a falsehood even in support of the truth."—*Lect. on Pul. Elog.* ; page 480.

8. W. GREENFIELD.—*Baptidzo*. To immerse, immerge, submerge, sink ; in New Testament to wash, perform ablution, cleanse ; to immerse, baptize, administer the rite of baptism. Met., to overwhelm one with anything. to bestow liberally, imbue largely. Pass., to be immersed in, or overwhelmed with miseries, oppressed with calamities ; whence *Baptisma*, properly what is immersed ; hence, immersion, baptism, ordinance of baptism ; met., misery, calamity. *Baptismos*. Immersion, baptism ; a washing, ablution."

9. Schleusner's Lexicon of New Testament.—[I have before given his definition of *baptidzo*.] "*Baptisma*. (1.) Proprie ; *immersio, intinctio in aquam, lotio*. Hinc transfertur (2) ad ritus sacrum, qui baptismus dicitur,

quo baptizandi olim in aquam immergebantur, ut veræ religioni divinæ obstringerentur.' Properly, immersion, dipping into water, washing. Hence it is (2) transferred to the sacred rite, which is called baptism, in which those formerly baptized were immersed in water, to obligate them to the true divine religion."

10. Leigh, a witness my opponent attempts to wrest so as to testify in favor of sprinkling, concerning the meaning of the term in the New Testament, after giving "to dip into" or "plunge under" as the native and proper signification of *baptidzo*, says, under *baptismos* :

"If we are willing to observe the import of the word, the term of baptism signifies immersion into water, or the act itself of immersing and washing off. Therefore, from the very name and etymology of the word, it appears what would in the beginning be the custom of administering baptism, whilst we now have for baptism rather *rhantism*, that is, sprinkling."

I say this is the witness Eld. Ditzler attempts to turn against my position, while every word he utters is against his own! I appeal to this audience if my opponent is willing to observe the native import of the word in his endeavors to support *rhantism* for baptism.

Stokius' *Clavis* of the New Testament (fourth edition, Leipsic,) after defining *baptidzo*, properly "to immerse," "to dip into water," says of

BAPTISMA.

'1.) Generatim et vi originis notat, *immersionem* vel *intincti nem*.
2.) Speciatim, *t*) *proprie* notat *immersionem*, vel *intinctionem* res in aquam, ut abluatur, vel lavetur. Hinc transfertur ad designandum *primum* Novi Testamenti sacramentum, quod *initiationis* vocant, nempe *baptismum*, quo baptizandi olim in aquam immergebeantur, utut hodiernum aqua iis saltem adspargatur, ut a peccati sordibus abluantur, illius remissionem consequantur, & in fœdus gratiæ recipiantur, tanquam hæredes vitæ æteræ."

"1. Generally, and by force of the original, it denotes immersion or dipping. 2. Specially, *a*. Properly, it denotes the immersion or dipping of a thing in water, that it may be cleansed or washed. Hence, it is transferred to designate the first sacrament of the New Testament, which they call of initiation, namely baptism, in which those to be baptized were, formerly immersed into water; though at this time the water is only sprinkled upon them, that they may be cleansed from the pollutions of sin, receive the remission of it, and be received into the covenant of grace as heirs of eternal life."

Now, you heard my opponent, in his last speech, affirm

that "Stokius gives 'wash,' 'cleanse,' as the only New Testament use of *baptidzo* as a rite!" I am compelled to deny this frankly, and to sustain my denial I submit the text, which I have in my hand.

BAPTIDZO.

"1.) Generatim ac vi vocis *intinctionis ac immersionis* notionem obtinet. 2.) Speciatim, a.) *proprie est immergere a' intingere in aquam*, b.) *Tropice*. 1) *per Metalepsin* est, *lavare, ablure*, quia aliquid intingi ac immergi solet in aquam ut lavatur, vel abluatur, equamquam, *lotio vel ablutio* fieri queat & soleat. (Marc vii, 4; Luc, xi, 38.)"—Stokii "Clavis Linguae Sanctos Novi Testamenti," p. 183.

"Generally, and by force of the word, it obtains the notion of a dipping and immersion. 2. Specially *a*. Properly, it is to immerse and to dip into water. *b*. Tropically 1. It is, by metonymy, to wash, to cleanse, because anything is accustomed to be dipped and immersed in water that it may be washed or cleansed; although washing or cleansing may, and is accustomed to be done by sprinkling water also.—Mark vii, 4; Luke xi. 38."

Mark particularly two things in this.

1. Stokius says that, properly it means only to "immerse," "to dip into," but *tropically*—*i. e.*, *by a figure of speech, where the effect is put for the cause*, and only then, it is used to mean "to wash," "to cleanse," because the thing to be washed is accustomed to be dipped and immersed in water that it may be washed.

2. Stokius gives it as his *opinion*, that the cleansing or washing he refers to in Mark vii. 4, and Luke xi. 38, was by sprinkling and not by immersion; but the ripest modern scholarship, as do Jewish writers, who ought to know their own customs, decide against Stokius' opinion in this instance. The very statements of Mark clearly show that *baptizonti* in the fourth verse must mean more than *nipsontai* in the third, for they always washed their hands before eating, though they never washed them by *sprinkling*, but, coming from market, lest they may have contracted ceremonial defilement, they did more, immersed themselves according to the traditions of their elders.

Dr. H. A. W. Meyer, in his Manual on the Gospels of Mark and Luke, says:

"The expression in Mark vii. 4, is not to be understood of the washing of the hands (as interpreted by Lightfoot and Wetstein), but of the *immersing*, which the word always means in the classics and the New Testament

that is here, according to the context, the taking of a bath. So Luke xi. 38. Having come from the market, where, among a crowd of men, they might have come in contact with unclean persons, they eat not without having first bathed themselves. The representation proceeds after the manner of a climax; before eating they *always* observe the washing of hands, but [employ] the *bath* when they come *from the market* and wish to take food."—Chase, p. 95.

I here close my argument proving that the Greek used by the New Testament writers was not different from that used by the Greeks of their age. The fact is, could my opponent prove that in classic Greek *baptidzo* was used generally in the sense of "to wet,," which is the most he has attempted to do, and concluding, as you can wet a thing by sprinkling, therefore *baptidzo* may sometimes mean to sprinkle, yet these authorities are sufficient to show that "to dip," "to immerse," is its invariable meaning in the New Testament. All these authorities also are Pedobaptists, and their testimony has the greater weight as they testify against their own practice. Mr. Greenfield, who examined the ancient Peschito Syriac, the Arabic, the Coptic, the Gothic of Ulphilas, the Modern Versions, the German of Luther, the Dutch, Danish, and Sweedish, which, with many others, all agree after giving his testimony (in a controversy respecting the transferring or translating of the Greek word into heathen language) in favor of immersion as the primitive meaning of the Greek *baptidzo*, said: "I wish it to be distinctly understood that I am neither a Baptist, nor the son of a Baptist; nor is it here my business to undertake a defense of their cause." Who can doubt that such is unexceptional testimony?

Consider this array of lexical authority, and then decide if Moses Stuart, himself a Pedobaptist, did not state the truth when he said;

"1 *Bapto* and *baptidzo* mean to *dip*, *plunge*, or *immerge* into anything liquid. All lexicographers, and critics of any note are agreed in this."—"Christian Baptism," by M. Stuart, p. 51.

Replication.

1. We learn from his last speech that though the proper rendering of the example—is to plunge, yet he may have done the plunging on dry land; horses frequently plunge on land!

And *mergo* in Latin often occurs for plunge, as he showed Mr. Wilkes, and therefore when an act is expressed by *mergo* there need be no going under water—it of course can be performed on dry land, as sprinkling is! I notice this as an illustration of his new philological method of getting to sprinkle as the historical primary of *baptidzo*! Criticism is simply impossible.

2. But he does make an attempt to refute my canon, *i. e.*, that literally you cannot sprinkle or pour persons or indivisible objects. I care not how often Eld. Ditzler refers to this. I want the minds of the masses called to and penetrated by the fact, for it itself settles the controversy on the action of baptism. Remember, it was Dr. Geo. Campbell, of England, a Presbyterian, who said the silly things Elder Ditzler ascribes to me, *i. e.*, if *baptidzo* meant to pour or to sprinkle, Christ would doubtless have said “*baptize the water upon the people.*” This must be evident to every one. My opponent uses language so loosely that he makes one modal verb mean a dozen different and opposite acts which is opposed to the genius of language and to our Rules of Interpretation. No word can have diverse, much less radically different meanings in the same place.

He certainly does not understand the difference between a metaphorical and a *literal* signification of a word, or he is determined that you shall not.

Let me once and for all, put this matter forever to rest in the minds of every person, young and old in this audience.

Every modal verb, *i. e.*, a verb that expresses some one *specific* act as to *sprinkle*, and noun formed from, it must have one specific meaning or it cannot be *modal i. e.*, express mode.

Now take the verbs he has mentioned, pour, sprinkle, moisten, wet, stain, color, wash, anoint, dip, or immerse. They do not mean one and the same thing, but evidently different things, and they cannot therefore be indicated by the same word, and they never are.

To pour denotes one kind of act, to sprinkle another and different act, therefore pouring is not sprinkling. If Christ commanded his apostles to pour, they disobeyed him if they sprinkled. You cannot pour by sprinkling, nor sprinkle by

pouring. To pour an object is to diffuse it in a stream, it indicates a diffusion in a continuous *stream* so long as the act continues. To sprinkle is to scatter into drops, if a liquid, or fine particles if a divisible object as ashes, sand, etc. They are two different acts and one word cannot truly and literally denote them. It is senseless to talk about the different modes of modal verbs like these. You cannot sprinkle or pour in different *ways*. There is only one way to sprinkle and one way to pour. So of the verb *to dip*, it is a modal verb. It denotes but *one act*, that of putting one thing into another, nothing less. You cannot sprinkle or pour by dipping, and *vice versa*. Therefore these three acts cannot be expressed by one word. If *baptidzo* means one of them, it *can properly and truly mean but one*. Christ commanded his apostles to pour, or to sprinkle or to dip, and if one, then he forbade either of the other two acts.

Take his other words, to wet, to stain—which are not modal verbs, but of generic signification. You can correctly predicate mode of them, because you can wet or stain in various ways, but any one ought to know that to *wet* does not mean to *stain*, therefore you cannot express them by one verb. All can see that to *stain*, does not mean to sprinkle, for one might stain a thing and not sprinkle it, or sprinkle, and stain nothing. Nor does moisten mean to wet or to dip, for it denotes something less; nor does to dip mean to moisten, for it expresses more. We can here see how figurative meanings, which are always secondary, originate. Wetting and moistening, and drenching, and soaking and dyeing, are sometimes the *effect* of dipping. When we speak of their effect, instead of the cause or act that produced it, we are said to speak figuratively, and the verb we use is one of the figurative uses of the verb to dip, and is classed in the lexicons as a secondary meaning. Origen spoke of Elijah's altar after having had twelve tubs of water poured upon it, so that the trench about it was filled with water—as *immersed*. But is immerse, a proper meaning of to pour? He used a figure called an Hyperbole. If he meant to denominate it a baptism—alluding to the Christian rite—then it was purely ideal and metaleptic.

You can understand the meanings given as the secondary signification of *baptidzo* in the lexicons; they are the *figurative* uses they have met with—as when a writer speaking of a land scourged by war, says of it, “it was baptized in the blood of its sons—bathed in the tears of orphans and widows—immersed “in calamities!” or persons “immersed in *studies*,” “in *taxes*,” “in *books*,” “in *cares*,” “in *wine*,” “in *sleep*.” These mislead no one. But what would you think of a scholar who should try to convince you that these were indeed *real* meanings of the verb “to immerse?” That immersion therefore signified the dripping or pouring of blood, or the staining of the ground with it, was really to immerse it? To feel distressed in mind, was to be immersed, that to study attentively was to be immersed, that to read a little here and there in a book, was to be immersed, that to be heavily taxed was to be immersed, to ask a boy questions faster than he can answer them, is to immerse him, to drink wine until intoxicated, is to be immersed—what would you think of such a trickster? You certainly would not call it scholarship. And yet this is the sort of lexicography he has treated you to throughout this discussion. Must we be inflicted with it to the end?

For the reason I have given you, Dr. Chas. Anthon, Episcopalian, one of the first linguists America ever produced, says on defining *baptidzo*—“It means to dip, to immerse, and its secondary meaning, IF IT EVER HAD ANY.” Why does he say this? Because he never saw a secondary that was a *real* signification, for *figurative* ones, are not real significations.

We can now better understand the declaration of his favorite lexicographer, Leigh, when he says *baptidzo* never signifies to wash or to cleanse, or anything but its native meaning of to dip or to immerse—except by consequence—which means the figure of speech known as metonymy.

And here, I may as well explain what we Baptists mean when we say, with C. Anthon and Moses Stuart, as we have a perfect right to say, that all lexicographers give to dip or immerse, as the only true and real meaning of *baptidzo*. We mean they all unite in giving this as its primary, which is the only real and true meaning. It is for this reason that I read

only the primary meanings the lexicons give to *baptidzo*, while he, as you all know, gave only figurative ones as those he relied upon to get sprinkle as a meaning of *baptidzo*! Nothing can be more foreign to the truth, than that *bapto* or *baptidzo* ever did, primarily or secondary, mean to sprinkle or to pour, and you have had only his unqualified assertions for it, as yet. But his unsupported assertions establish nothing, except his utter lack of proof—for if he had proofs, he certainly would present them, rather than mere assertions. He challenges me to gainsay some assertions which he calls *facts*. I do gainsay them, by positively and emphatically denying them to be *facts*.

After three days—for I called his attention to it in my first argument on the first day of the debate—he makes the appearance of a reply to my canon, which I have urged in almost every speech for four days—*i. e.* that Christ commanded *persons*, and not *water*, to be baptized, and therefore *baptidzo* cannot mean to sprinkle or pour. I may have presented the matter feebly—the day is coming when a thousand lips and pens will accept the argument and present it with tenfold power—still the stern grammatical fact is there, that when persons or indivisible things are the objects of the verbs to pour or to sprinkle they must take the preposition in or upon, expressed or in composition. He has just asserted again, and I propose to discuss this point as long as he makes such assertions—that

“the same words that mean to pour, to sprinkle, mean also, in many cases, to moisten, to wet, others to sprinkle, then stain, color, others to pour, then to anoint, wash, cleanse—the vast majority of them coming also to mean dip, whelm, immerse, submerge.”

This is simply impossible, irrational and absurd. There is not a verb in any language that a son of Adam ever spoke, that meant or means all these radically different significations. I fully met this position at the commencement of this address, but he now says nothing is more common in Greek usage than for the verbs to pour, to sprinkle, to take indivisible nouns, as direct objects.

“In Greek nothing is more common than to say sprinkle a man—any one—*rainen tina*—*rainen anthron*—*rainen seuton*—sprinkle oneself, etc.”

If Elder Ditzler will consult the best Greek lexicons of classic writers, he will find that they tell him that *raino* and *theo cheo*

are used “*strictly with liquids or of divisible objects* and if used with solids, water, blood, dust, as a direct object etc., etc., or is understood if not expressed. We can say sprinkle a man *with* water, but it is a figure, for the water and not the man is sprinkled. Paul said that Moses sprinkled the book, and the people, tabernacle and vessels, etc., but it was by the figure called metonymy when rhetorically one thing is put for another; the people for the blood that was sprinkled upon them. So by this figure Jerusalem and all Judea went out to John’s baptism, the city and the land put for the people.

So David said, “sprinkle me with hyssop,” and this is by the same figure—the thing that contains for that which is contained—the hyssop, for the blood and water of purification it contained, which was the real object sprinkled—not David, nor the hyssop branch.

Why will not Elder Ditzler explain this language as figurative and not mislead the people.

But in enacting law, all figures must be eschewed, and all terms used in their primary, or most literal and usual significations.

As this is as important a matter as can be raised under the question, let us examine every case in the word of God where sprinkle is used, and see if it is used of indivisible objects with or without a preposition as a rule.

1. The first case is Exodus ix, 8, “let Moses sprinkle *ashes*” no preposition before ashes in Hebrew or Greek text, nor in Syriac or Latin versions—ashes can be scattered.

2. Lev., xiv, 7, sprinkle on him to be cleansed—here we find *al*, on, in Hebrew and Syriac, *peri* in Greek, *hyper* in Latin.

3. Lev., xiv, 51, “He shall sprinkle the house seven times,” here our version uses a figure, but the Hebrew and Syriac have their prepositions, *al on*, also Greek and Latin versions.

4. Lev., xvi, 14. “He shall sprinkle *on* the mercy seat,” all in Hebrew and Syriac, etc.

5. Lev., xvi, 15, 5. The same.

6. Num., viii, 7, “Sprinkle the water,” *al*, upon them.

10. Num., xix, 18. "And the clean person shall sprinkle *al* upon the unclean."

11. The eleventh is found in the 20th, verse of the same chapter—"the water of separation hath not been sprinkled, *al* upon him."

12. The twelfth in course is in Isaiah lii, 15, "so shall he—*yazzah*—King James' translation renders it sprinkle, but the correct rendering is doubtless to be found in the Greek version made by seventy learned Jews, who translate it, "*thau-madzo*"—*astonish*, met. as if sprinkle is the verb—water of purification is the element understood.

13. The next is found in Ezekiel, xxxvi, 25, "I will sprinkle clean water *al* upon you."

Where is my learned friend's "double accusative," in all these instances?

Now if he will open his Syriac version of the Old Testament, he will likewise find *al*, on, upon, in connection with the verb to sprinkle in all these instances! If he will deign to refer to the Greek of the septuagint, he will find *peri*, upon, and the Latin version has *super*, and the English version has on or upon in every one of these instances. The only exception to the above, is in Heb., ix, 19—when in Greek it is elliptically expressed, but my friend's "grand old Syriac" which he declares equal or superior to the Greek text, in this instance has *al* upon—*besprinkled* or "sprinkled upon," etc.

Touching upon the verb to *pour*, he cannot find an instance in the word of God where persons or living beings were commanded to be poured, nor where they were commanded to be sprinkled, but always the liquid, ashes or sand, to be sprinkled or poured upon them. To ridicule is the easiest way to dispose of an argument—will he charge the Holy Spirit with folly?—(*Time out*).

DR. DITZLER'S FIFTEENTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—An extraordinary speech it is to which you have just listened. He has more than once invited sharp criticism, and he will only regret his last effort *once*, that will be while he lives. He has drawn the fire, he must endure the flame. For a man to come here with nothing scarcely but compilations and compendiums, blundering through Glossaries for lexicons, relying on good, bad and indifferent, misunderstanding them, mangling *every* lexicon he attempted to translate, disregarding punctuation, and dealing in the most reckless assertions we ever heard from a religious man. To attack our quotations is cool indeed. I did not expect to see him wince, squirm and writhe so fearfully under the little touch-up I gave him about reading his lexicons from second-hand authorities, and making great lexicographers blunder also by making *baptidzo* mean to dye. So he avenges himself by daring and furious assaults. He runs after the wrong man. Dr. Graves *did* say Gazes wrote on modern Greek. He *did not* say a word about *commentary*, or that they were “commentators rather than lexicographers”—Gazes and Kouma, though he now puts it in the record thus. And I will now convict him of *self-stultification* by his last speech—an error he would have escaped had he heeded our Louisville Debate or Conant’s letter.

In his thirteenth speech Dr. Graves quotes Suidas, the native Greek of the tenth century, thus, as defining *baptidzo*, “to immerse, to immerge, to dip, to dip in.” Now read his fifteenth speech, and he quotes Conant, their great Baptist of New York who tells him truly, “Suidas has only *baptidzo*. HE GIVES NO DEFINITION OF THE WORD!!!” Now where did these immersionists get all their immerse, dip, dip into, from? They made it. Suidas defines *bapto* by only one word—*pluno*, to wash, and it was out of that they carried all of these definitions, or rather out of their own brains. Some of our writers have copied the same out of their writers.

Dr. Graves quotes Scapula as defining *baptidzo*—*item tingo*—which he renders “immerse.” He can’t find a lexicon on earth that defines *baptidzo* by *tingo*. They often define *bapto* by it, for both often mean to stain, color, dye; whereas *baptidzo* never does, and *tingo* is too ambiguous therefore to be used in defining *baptidzo*. Next he renders it “immerse.” He can’t find a lexicon on this continent or imported that gives immerse as a first, second or third meaning of *tingo*, and not over one in five that renders it dip, either. A number gives sprinkle or or besprinkle, while all the most critical give it as the equivalent of “*hugraino*”—sprinkle with water.

He quotes Tromonius for a lexicographer. I have the work he cites, and the little glossary is not by him, and is written solely to define the *Hexapla* of Origen, a work that has *baptidzo* only about twice in it, and used not in a religious sense, once for *sink*, once for “overwhelm”—so Conant and Baptists generally render it there.

He quotes Leigh as saying “the native and proper signification of it (*baptidzo*) is to dip into water.”—Speech 13th. He says not a word of it. He is in my hand here. That is a quotation he copies from an immersionist. Leigh says just the reverse.

In his fifteenth speech Dr. Graves cites Leigh under *baptismos*, hoping to thrive better. But alas! it is the same thing. Leigh is there quoting Zipperus, an immersionist. Leigh then cites to offset him, Danæus, that it occurs in the New Testament for washing, purification, and Becann, that it is from *baptein*, “to moisten,” to wet (*madefacere*), to wash, *lavare*.

Leigh’s definition is—“Primarily, it may signify by washing of any kind or immersion, which may be in water vessels in which we immerse linen. Yet largely and more extendedly also it is taken for any kind of washing whatever, purification or cleansing, even of that in which there is no kind of immersion.”—Matt. iii, 11.* That is Leigh. Hence he endorses as

* Leigh’s *Critica Sacra*, 1706.

Primario significet istiusmodi lotionem seu immersionem, quæ in vasis aquariis sit, quibus lintea immergimus; tamen largius et latius etiam sumitur pro quocunque genere ablutionis, prolutionis seu mundationis, etiam illius, cui nulla immersionis species adest. Matt. iii 11; xx, 22; Mar. c. vii, 4; x, 38 Luc. iii, 16, etc.

a true meaning "*adspargere*," sprinkle where it is baptism, and no kind of immersion present.

But this will do as a sample of how Dr. Graves and his co-laborers quote authorities, till we look into his charges against us, then we will see more of the same kind of quotation and translation.

Dr. Graves now takes up Schleusner, *not as I read him in this debate* nor as I read him at Louisville, but as reported in that debate, and charges that "intentionally or through ignorance," "by suppressing an *important* sentence, made Schleusner say what he does not say." Go slow, Doctor. I know defeat is hard to bear and *hurts dreadfully*.

Let us place my Louisville quotation and the whole text of Schleusner up to that point, side by side, give a perfectly literal rendering of him, and see if it changes his meaning in the least.

SCHLEUSNER IN FULL SO FAR AS
THAT PART GOES.

Baptidzo properly: to immerse or dip, to plunge into water, from *bapto*, and answers to [*i. e.*, translates] the Hebrew *tabhal*, II Kings v, 14, in the Alexandrian Version AND to *tabha* in the version of Symmachus, Psalms lxxviii, 5, AND (et) in one uncertain [as to its translation?] Psalms ix, 6. But in this sense it never occurs in the New Testament, but very frequently [it so occurs] in the Greek writers; see for example, Diodorus, Siculus, of the overflowing of the Nile.

SCHLEUSNER AS IN LOUISVILLE DE-
BATE.

"Properly, to immerse or dip, to plunge into water, from *bapto*. . . But in this sense it never occurs in the New Testament, but it does occur very frequently in the Greek [classic] writers, for example, in Diodorus Siculus, of the overflowing of the Nile," etc.

Now, because not unfrequently anything is accustomed to be *immersed* or dipped *into water* that it may be cleansed, hence, 2, it means to cleanse, to wash, to purify with water. Thus it occurs in the New Testament, Mark vii, 4. And coming from the market except they baptize themselves (in certain copies it reads sprinkle themselves), etc. *metaphorically*, as the Latin, to imbue, to administer and give to largely and copiously, to pour forth abundantly." *

* Schleusner, Novum Lex. New Test. Glasguae, 1824 3 vols. *Baptidzo* 1. proprie: immergo ac intingo, in aquam mergo, a baptizo et respondet Hebraico *abal* 2 Reg. v, 14, in Vers. Alex. et *tabha*, apud Symmachum Psalm lxxviii, 5. et apud incertum, Ps. ix, 6. In hac autem significatione

What Schleusner, Wahl, etc., mean by give to, administer to or imbue largely, is told by Wahl under *ekcheo*, to pour out, "*effundo*," i. e., do give largely (*largiter do*, *largiter imbruo*, etc.) to imbue largely. That is, it is to (*ekcheo*) pour out upon them whatever was described—the Spirit—baptize them.

1. We never changed the meaning of Schleusner in one iota. We never left out a "sentence," but two Hebrew words and the texts referred to—which not a word was defined only from—"and answers to the Hebrew *tabhal*" to "Psalms 1. and 16. Now, how does that affect the sense?

2. Elder Wilkes looked on it as I did as to *that* point, and knew it did not affect the meaning.

3. Dr. Graves now wilfully suppresses a part, *leaves out* an important word, that connects the words together—*et, et*, "*and to tabha*."

4. Now see how Dr. Graves quotes Schleusner on *two* other occasions. DR. GRAVES' QUOTATION OF SCHLEUSNER, July 4th, 1868, "*The Baptist*," where 15 lexicons are cited.

"*Baptidzo*, 1. Immerse, dip, plunge in water. 2. Wash cleanse, bathe in water." Now, where are the above Hebrew words, texts and all? He leaves all out. But in the same article he says; "Not one of these Pedobaptist authors or Lexicographers gives sprinkle or pour as a definition of *baptidzo*."

Yet Schleusner gives "*pour forth*"—*profundo*. Now let us see how Dr. Graves quotes him in his 13th speech, where he cites lexicons:

Schleusner.—"*Baptidzo*. 1. *Proprie: immerso, ac intingo, in aquam mergo, a BAPTO, et respondet Hebraico tabal*, 2 Kings, v. 14. (Properly to immerse and dip in, to immerse into water, from *bapto*; and it answers to the Hebrew *tabal*, 2 K. v. 14)" * * *

Here Dr. Graves leaves out nearly every word I left out, then

numquam in N. T. sed eo frequentives in scriptt. Gr. legitur, v. c. Diod. Sic. 1, c. 36 de Nilo exundante, Strabo, Polyb., etc. Jam, quia haud raro aliquid immergi ac intingo in aquam solet, ut lavetur, hinc 2. *abluo, lavo aqua purgo* notat. Sic legitur in N. T. Marc. vii, 4, *kai apo agoras eau me baptisoontai*) in quibusdam codd. *Rhantisoontai*) *ouk esthiouei* et res, in foro coemtas, nisi prius aqua ablutæ et purgatæ fuerint, non edunt. Luk. xi, 38. *ebaptisthee* lavasse. *Baptizesthai* non solum *lavare*, sed etiam *se lavare* significare, multis locis probare potest. 3. Hinc transferetur ad *baptismi ritum solemnen*, etc. 4. Metaphorice; ut Lat. *imbruo, large et copiose do, a'que supposito largiter profundo*.

leaves out all the definition. Schleusner gives every word of which I quoted in the Louisville debate. But that is not all. He makes Schleusner say *baptidzo* is used in the New Testament sense as *tabhal* is in 2 Kings, v. 14, where Haaman "*baptized* himself"—"dipped himself" in our version. Is *baptidzo* so used in the New Testament? Are we to "dip ourselves?"

5. He makes Schleusner say *baptidzo* is used in classic Greek in the sense of *tabha*, but never so in the New Testament. Well then he concedes two damaging things.

1. That *baptidzo* is never used in the New Testament in the sense it is "in Greek writers."

2. That as *tabha* in those texts, and always in the Bible, means "to immerse" and has no other meaning, then Schleusner says *baptidzo* NEVER occurs in the sense of immerse in the Bible. Then

3. He makes Schleusner say *tabha* applies to inundations, etc. ! Yea, Dr. Graves says *tabha* is used in the sense of "immersion or *overwhelming*." *Tabha* never meant overwhelm in any book in all the world. No authority on earth ever so rendered it. But it "results in causing the subject to perish," he tells us. Has he not adduced a number of texts where *baptidzo* occurs to prove that the parties were immersed and perished?

And then does he not in this same 15th speech try to prove that *classic* use is *the same* as New Testament use? What does he mean? Has he been under Ewing? We will test him on this matter soon.

It has been urged that "*hac*" in the sentence "*In hac significatione*" refers to the latter *tabha*, in contrast with the former *tabhal*, as if Schleusner said in *this* sense—of *tabha*—it never occurs in the New Testament, but very frequently does in Greek writers, etc. But Schleusner is not referring to the Hebrew words at all, but to his definition, "*immergo ac intingo*," etc., and the "*hac*" regards them as a unity, one, all as of the same force. Indeed, in Latin, were not this the case even, as unquestionably it is, we often have such Latin in patristic use as this, *sive hac sive illa*, either this or that, the *hac* referring to the first, and so is against the Doctor. But *hac* implies unity of meaning; in the modal sense of immerse, dip, plunge,

it is not used in the New Testament, but in sense of wash, cleanse, *abluo*, *lavo*, in any way whatever.

Dr. Wilkes never took the schute Dr. Graves has but saw into Schleusner's meaning far better. His meaning is that *baptidzo* is not used *modally* in the New Testament, but as a rite, symbolic in its nature, and embraces sprinkling, pouring, dipping. That is his meaning, and clearly so; for he expressly 1st says "in *this* sense"—that is, of "dip, immerse, plunge," "it NEVER occurs in the New Testament." Because it came, as he held to mean "to wash, cleanse," he says, "Thus it occurs in the New Testament," and cites Mark vii. 4 as a case, and that "in certain copies it is *sprinkle*." That shows what he held.

2. He gives "*pour forth*" as a New Testament use. Dr. Graves discovers that *baptisma* is more important than *baptidzo*. Indeed! *It does not occur but once* in the New Testament for Christian baptism. Yet is more important than the word used by Christ in the commission!! See this shows the headless onset of a heated controversialist.

He says I suppose Schleusner's immersion under *baptisma*. Did I quote or profess to quote him on *baptisma*? Dr. Wilkes and I contended over Bible use, and I, as in this debate, urged that it is used in the New Testament in the sense of *baptism* a word of ordinance, and quoted Schleusner on that, and he never adduces it as a case of suppression, when I had freely agreed that immerse was one of its meanings. But Dr. Graves says I suppressed his meaning. He ought to *know* it is not so. But let us see Dr. Graves' capacity a little further. In his paper, July 4th, 1868, he quotes Suicer—"immerse, wash"—Suicer has baptize—"by immersion or sprinkling."

Dr. Graves quotes Passow—"immerse often, submerge; hence, 1. To moisten, to wet. 2. Draw water. 3. Baptize, wash." After all these, he says, "*not one* of the Pedobaptist authors and Lexicographers gives sprinkle or pour as a definition of *baptidzo*!!" Yet Passow gives "sprinkle," "*generally* to sprinkle upon, to pour upon." Now, he renders exactly the same German words of the above, "immerse after, submerge" by "to dip in, or under, often and repeatedly." And *that* is

his *primary* meaning of *baptidzo*, and classic and New Testament meanings are the same!! He can change his own translations! He is like Liddell and Scott—change every year.

On Stokius, Dr. Graves:

1. He suppresses several very important sentences: (1.) To destroy his meaning. (2.) To weaken the use we make of him.

STOKIUS IS QUOTED BY DR. GRAVES,
FIFTEENTH SPEECH.

"Generally, and by force of the word, it obtains the notion of a dipping and immersion. 2. Specially, *a.* Properly, it is to immerse and to dip into water. *b.* Tropically. 1. It is, by metonymy, to wash, to cleanse, because anything is accustomed to be dipped and immersed in water that it may be washed or cleansed; although washing or cleansing may, and is accustomed to be done by sprinkling water also. (Mark vii. 4; Luke xi. 38.)"

STOKIUS AS HE IS.

"1. Generally, and by the force of the word, it obtains the sense of immersing or dipping. Specially (a) properly it is to dip or immerse in water. 3. (b) Tropically by a *metalepsis* it is to wash, to cleanse, because a thing is usually dipped or immersed in water that it may be washed or cleansed, *although also* BY SPRINKLING the water the washing or cleansing can be, AND GENERALLY IS, *accomplished*, Mark vii. 4; Luke ix. 38. Hence, it is transferred to the sacrament of baptism. 3. Metaphorically, (a) it designates the pouring out of the Holy Spirit upon the apostles and other believers on account of the abundance of the gifts of the Holy Spirit since anciently *the water was POURED copiously* upon those baptized, or they were sunk deep in the water," etc. *baptismos*, lotio, ablutio, baptismus—*baptismos* (noun), washing, cleansing. baptism."

Now, Stokius explains himself. He leaves no obscurity. By a *metalepsis* it came to mean *to wash*. So Witsius and Stuart and Beza argued exactly, as we quoted. Yet the two first held that 3000 on Pentecost, the 5000, Lydia, etc., were *all* baptized by sprinkling. Was it metaphorical? Has Dr. Graves to be told that they all held that metaphorical meanings became THE STANDARD meanings? Did not Beza say the water was "poured by John" in baptizing? Was that metaphorical? Yet he reasoned as Stuart does, and Schleusner: Hence, Stokius says, "the washing or cleansing could be, and generally was accomplished by sprinkling the water, Mark vii. 4; Luke xi. 38. HENCE, transferred to the sacrament of baptism." Now, when he tells us it was by sprinkling, and *hence* (*hinc*) transferred to the sacrament of baptism," and follows it up as he does, not once giving dip or immerse as a Bible use, my

words stand approved. Dr. Graves tells us Schleusner gives it as "*his opinion*" as above. What is any man's definition but his view or opinion? He says not a word about opinion. But his definitions were all his opinions just as all other men's definitions are their opinions. Such worming about is unworthy of the name of decent puerility or clever nonsense.

Dr. Graves seeks then to destroy Schleusner's testimony by making him contradict himself. But the comment Dr. Graves makes is on a word *never* found in any Greek work before the New Testament was written, and *hence* the difference—the *very marked* difference he makes in defining the two and their use. Under the word Dr. Graves cites, his words are—"baptism, which *THEY call* [the sacrament] of *initiation* in which those baptized were anciently immersed in water, as now-a-days the water is merely sprinkled on them." Notice now—

1. *No scripture—no text* is cited. It is not *Bible* usage he speaks of, but later. Hence,

2. It is *patristic* use, the usage of *the fathers* Stokius is here discussing. Hence, he introduces it by saying "*they call* it [the sacrament] of *initiation*"—who *thus* immersed. But *where* in the New Testament, is baptism called "*initiation*," "first sacrament" "*primum sacramentum*"? It is true that during the dark ages when they (*vocant*) call it these things, they did immerse mainly.

Dr. Graves quotes Wahl thus:

"*Baptidzo*, f. iso. (*abapto*, *mergo*; *sæpius mergo*, in New Test.): 1. *imergo* (universe— Jos. Ant. ix, 10, 2; xv, 3, 3. Polyb. i, 51, 6) *a* (*proprie et quidem de immersione sacra.*) (*From bapto, to immerse; often to immerse in the New Testament*). First, *to immerse*, (*always in Jos. Ant. 9, 10, 2; and 15, § 3. Polyb. i, 51, 6.*) (*a*) *properly and truly concerning sacred immersion.*"

1. If you will notice the Latin in parenthesis, and his rendering, you will have proof that Dr. Graves does not so punctuate it as to correctly interpret Wahl.

2. Wahl changed his definition during that same year, and in one edition I have, it is: 1, "to wash, besprinkle—*lavo*—and 2, immerse."

In a third edition, 1831, he changes again, and has immerse, overwhelm, imbue—and by imbue he shows under *ekcheo*,

"pour out" means it is by pouring, to sprinkle (*perfundo*) *nipito*, wash the hands, *lavo*, wash, besprinkle. *Lavo* wherever modal, is sprinkle, besprinkle, and every Latin lexicon I ever saw gives besprinkle as a meaning.

Dr. Graves leaves out the definition of Swarzius, in his Ingham, "to sprinkle, to besprinkle, to pour upon," who gives them as *literal* meanings, as well as Passow, Rost & Palm. He told us he would mainly give the first recorded definitions, it is true; but when his own Ingham and Booth both tell him this great and voluminous lexicon—a great German standard, gives these, and it is translated by immersionists as above, how dare he say I gave no lexicon with sprinkle, etc., as *literal* meanings?

Can you fail to see the partisan "controversialist" in all this? Stephanus is not a German lexicographer, as he said. He was born in Paris, descended of a Provencal family, was born about 1502. Here then we have five great German lexicographers on *classic* Greek—Swarzius, Schneider, Passow, Palm, Rost—all giving "sprinkle," "pour upon," as *literal* meanings, the three last telling us that is the *general* meaning.

Wahl, New Testament lexicon, gives sprinkle as a *literal* meaning. But why multiply such testimonies? *They appeal from the lexicons*, we followed, now they fly back to them, deserting the "ultimate authorities," just as they desert versions now and fly back to James, whom twenty-five to thirty years ago they traduced and anathematized. Now its greatest blunders *are their* delight.

Dr. Graves says Sophocles is a "lexicon of standard authority by Americans and Germans." I squarely deny it and challenge him to the proof. He can't find one single commentator, critic or scholar in Germany who ever quoted him. Nor have I ever seen him quoted in America, save by the "disciples," and I quoted him only because they did. Dr. Graves misquotes him also. Sophocles defines *baptidzo* by bathe, ablution, and cites a Greek text where it is used for "baptize with tears." Where is the "dip" or "immerse" here?

Dr. Graves dares to say that he endorses the statements his partisans heaped on my sermons while in Texas! I tell him I do *not* endorse all the statements of our papers about *him*.

He now urges that to deny that New Testament Greek is unlike classic Greek "is a last argument." Of course it is in the use of *baptidzo* that this is brought up. Then he puts to shame all candor by asserting that his "opponent and a *few* other controversialists" claim this!! HE KNOWS THERE IS NOT A SCHOLAR IN EUROPE OR AMERICA BUT THAT SO HOLDS. He knows that Horne, Fairbairn, Geo. Campbell, his main ally, Stuart, Winer, Ernesti, Walton, S. Davidson, Ed. Robinson—all so hold.

He knows that any scholar would stultify himself to deny it.

Geo. Campbell tells us the difference between New Testament Greek and classic Greek is so great that those who used the latter would not know what was meant by some of the words in Greek in the New Testament.

So far as Greek is concerned, classic Greek suits my purposes far better than any other, as has been seen. But I will present some of the facts, not one of which he can deny, that you may see the extreme folly of his boasting on that subject, and know the whole truth.

1. In classic (heathen) Greek, *baptidzo* is never applied to any religious or heathen ordinances.

2. Nowhere is it, or are names derived from it, applied to religious washings, purifications, or "initiations," etc.

3. Nowhere does the verb *baptidzo* or any name derived from the verb apply to any kind of washing.

4. In the Bible and Apochrypha its names are *always* applied to religious washings.

5. In classic Greek *baptidzo* *always* leaves the object of its action under the element to the extent it puts it there, only expresses the extent to which it penetrates.

6. In the new Testament it never has such force or use.

7. In classic Greek it often means to make drunk, intoxicate, drown, overwhelm, submerge, leaving its object in that

condition; burden or overwhelm with debts, questions, misfortunes. All admit this. Conant, Campbell and all other writers of note give many such instances.

8. In the New Testament it never has such meaning.

9. As a religious word *immerse* cannot represent *baptidzo*. The English of *immerse* we have seen is to *sink in*. This is admitted. How can *sink* or *sink in* represent baptism. An object may sink in mud, in filth, in any penetrable element—is it baptized?

10. As a *classic* word *dip* or *baptize* cannot represent *baptidzo*, for the latter means most generally in classic Greek to asperse, abuse; whelm, overwhelm, intoxicate, soak, make drunk, overwhelm with debts, taxes, questions, drown. *Dip* does not represent *any* of these.

11. While an object is *immersed* it is not baptized. It requires *emersion*, rising out of the element to make it baptism. *Immersion* is only half of the action of the ordinance. Half of a thing cannot be equivalent to the whole of it, hence immersion is not baptism.

That you may see the point between *dip* and baptism—immerse and baptism, let us illustrate. Were you to envelop a man in India rubber clothes, so that no water could penetrate, and dip him clear under, would he be baptized in the New Testament sense? No. Were you to sink him twenty feet deep, have it so he could breathe and remain an hour, he is immersed, most assuredly. Not a drop of water though touches him. Is he *baptized*? No! The one was dipped, the other immersed—neither was baptized. There was your pretended burial, but no baptism. Why? “I baptize you *WITH* WATER.” He uses immersed *in* water, not baptized *with* it. This should show every one that *mode* is not the essential, and that *dip*, immerse as such, is not baptism.

He says he is in company with Webster, and Geo. Campbell, etc., in his wild and puerile theory that to sprinkle necessarily implies to scatter in drops. He never saw such a canon in any writer of standing among scholars, and he never will. If our exposure is unsound why does he not meet it? Take one more example.

All his standard Latin lexicons will tell him that *tingo* is equivalent to the Greek *hugraino*. This is compounded of *hudor* water, and *raino* to sprinkle. It is used by Homer and on down—takes the direct accusative, and *never*, that I saw, an intervening preposition. It not only means to sprinkle any one with water, but to wash, to bathe, take a bath—always the accusative. What can he oppose to all these multiplied facts? Nothing but a bold and reckless body of assertions. And with little grace does it come from one whose extracts are nearly all second-hand; nearly all garbled; one who has lived in the fiercest *personal* controversy, to sneer so often at his own profession, when it falls so harmlessly at our feet. He quotes Conant's shameless letter where he suppresses the (*brecho*) to shed forth, sprinkle, and the (*epi chuno*) pour upon, etc., of Gazes, and the "besprinkle" of Kouma!

Then he says, "mark one thing, he has not yet produced a standard lexicon that gives 'to sprinkle,' or 'to pour' as the literal, current definition of *bapto* or *baptidzo*!! When a man is so full of jokes it is difficult to understand him in all his moods. The great Schneider gives *brecho* sprinkle, shed forth, as the *general* equivalent of *baptidzo*. Kouma and Gazes, native born profound Greek scholars, the latter spent much time in the great universities of Germany. It is the basis of Schneider's large lexicon. Rost and Palm give "sprinkle," "sprinkle upon, pour upon," and state that to be its *general* meaning. To evade its force, Dr. Graves perverts the German *begiessen*. Rabbi Wisa, an enthusiastic immersionist is too candid a scholar to risk his reputation in such evasions, and translates it "sprinkle." S. Davidson, whose superior does not live, as a critic, translates it sprinkle. Rost and Palm *themselves* use it for *sprinkle*. Thieme's German—English Worterbuch (Dictionary) translates it "to water, to sprinkle." But what cares Dr. Graves for all that? when Dr. Graves says: "The reporter's notes show that when you brought forward Passow, you did not give the primary meaning until I called upon you to do it," we tell him, he is fearfully misled by anger and passion. The reporter has no notes, unless this much—"Reads;" for I read my speech, as you know, till I came to my last three

lexicons—omitting them till all the rest were adduced, then, knowing the writings of our opponents under Stokius, Schleusner and Passow, I opened and read them all *in full*, and *repeated* them, giving every meaning; and my opening speech will show that on Passow I gave “immerse and submerge,” and I remember very distinctly that Dr. Graves was seated by Dr. Varden and as I read “immerse, submerge” he nodded his head, and in an undertone said, “that’s right.” He never asked me to read a word of it. In a *later* speech, when quoting Passow, he called for it. He forgets. What misleads Dr. Graves is, he saw the speech as published in the Carrollton *Democrat*, and I had all authors briefly quoted in the point at issue—does it imply *affusion*? And I had not time to copy those lengthy extracts into it during debate, and there is the snare that has caught the Doctor’s feet. Passow also gives “sprinkle,” “*generally*, to sprinkle upon, to pour upon.” Our first speech has the whole save his quotation of Rost and Palm, and they are the same as Passow.

Schleusner quotes that “in certain manuscripts it is *rantizontai*” sprinkle, instead of *baptizontai*, Dr. Graves says “they are *few*—two perhaps.” He adds: “not the *oldest*” Now look at the facts. There are *nine* such, embracing the two oldest in the world—Sinaiticus and Vatican! Cannot every one see that the Doctor is simply desperate and in the bag all over. But to correct. Hence it is “many” as in “certain” MSS. He says many authorities when considerably below nine. It is sprinkle in Euthimius also, a Greek of the 4th century. Yet on such a blunder as his here he bases an attack on my declaration or rendering of one word of no value to the point, when there were many, and embracing all the oldest and best copies of the Bible in the known world.

But let us sum up a little. We have *all* the lexicons—25 Hebrew, 32 of the greatest Greek lexicons, 5 Arabic lexicons, the equivalent of 23 Syriac lexicons, 2 natives when it was a spoken language; besides Æthiopic, Chaldee, Persic and Latin—making quite a hundred of the greatest standards of all ages—all with me and against my opponent.

Then A. Campbell’s rendering showed *buptidzo* never means

to dip. Conant's renderings show that he out of 63 consecutive occurrences did not find it meaning dip in a single instance in the 63 cases, and immerse only 10 times, while it was "whelm" and overwhelm 53 times. Ingham found it meaning to dip only once in 169 cases, in his estimation. In a word—the summary of seven or eight—see my first speech—of the greatest lights immersion has produced, finds *baptidzo* meaning to dip only 18 times out of an average of 475, that is 457 against 18 for dip!! But, he falls back on *current* usage—*usus loquendi*. But are all these great scholars, the most renowned Baptists they have ever had, are they all a body of dolts? Are they a set of ignoramuses? Was Gale a fool, Carson an idiot and Conant and A. Campbell imbeciles? Who dare challenge their mental vigor? If Dr. Graves is correct as to lexicons, all these men are fools. And why did Carson admit—p. 55—that he had all the lexicographers so against him on his position? It was the same position exactly that Dr. Graves holds. He said, "My position is that it (*baptidzo*) always means to dip." He then admits all the commentators and lexicons are against him. Carson was frank. By his own canon no Baptist is baptized, save those who come from us. Dip is no meaning of *baptidzo*; immerse is a very rare meaning, and to sink is not a safe way to be baptized. Immersing is *sinking*, not coming out. *Usus loquendi* crushes him. *Usus loquendi* interpreted by Conant, Gale and Carson—all Baptist—their greatest scholars is AGAINST them as 457 against 18!!!

The Doctor returns once more to Agamemnon, and thinks an old superstition required his immersion in that lake. Let it be produced. There was no such requirement. If so, then in English, it would read, "he shall sink himself in the lake." That would be equivalent to drown himself in the lake. If a word had been used like our word plunge simply, it would not involve submersion necessarily at all. What Dr. Graves means by "no book giving Origen for *baptidzo* rendered sprinkle," we say, the Doctor being hard of hearing, gets *bapto* and *baptidzo* confounded, that is all.

He says Gazes, and a half-dozen lexicons, say so and

so. Has it come to that now? Come, Doctor, that is too bad. You have been scolding me these three or four days for having these enormous books, these fearful folios, and now, all at once, they are like the drowning man who hailed old Noah's ark, "why, it's no rain at all, only a little shower!" Gazes is as large as half a dozen of his Liddell and Scott he so prizes. Suicer's definition quotes as much on *baptidzo* as would cover twenty or twenty-five pages of Liddell and Scott I reckon, were one to count, while Liddell and Scott's definitions can be covered by a square inch. The Doctor is wild—rubbed up against Ewing too much.

He next quotes Leigh as saying, "it never signifies *lavare* (wash) except by consequence." Mistaken again. Leigh is quoting Beza there to show his view, as he does many others in his lexicon. Leigh's definition is, it primarily applies to any washing, even "to that where there is no immersion;" that it is *adspargere*, "to sprinkle," quoting Vossius. When the Doctor tells you I have not given you an authority for sprinkling he only means that he is tired of serious debate and high tragedy and is joking you awhile till he rallies; he'll get sober soon.

I never stated that a version was equal to the original. I read where others so held, and where Gale considers the Syriac nearly as authoritative as the original. I found Drs. Judd and Graves had said all I wanted, and read from and endorsed them. As to the lexicons, he has to translate his lexicons on Greek just as we do on Syriac. If he has Liddell and Scott in English, so I have Catafago written originally in English, defining baptize in Arabic (*amad*), by "to be wet with rain." So is the Latin definition of the Greek work of Castell. We have no trouble here. We know what words these authors use for sprinkle, pour, dip, or immerse. Indeed, the words for dip, immersion are very ambiguous while their *adspargo*, *perfundo*, *profundo*, *affundo*, *begiessen*, etc., are perfectly clear, definite, decisive, unambiguous.

Poor Liddell and Scott come up again. Why does not the Doctor meet the points we make against his favorite lexicon?

He hitches on to the first meaning. Why does he not take his author's first meaning, "dip repeatedly?" He sees it will not do. He abandons it at once. Why not settle on some standard or rule of interpretation? All is uncertainty with him. Liddell and Scott keep changing, drop out, take on, and yet won't get right. Now Passow and these great authorities we quote, are sustained by the facts. Origen, Basil, Demosthenes, Alcibiades, Pindar, all the earlier Greeks, as well as later ones, like Origen, use *baptidzo* for sprinkle and pour, as well as the root of it, *bapto*. Anthon shows that *bapto* is applied to tinging, coloring the parts about the eyes, the face. Hence we put Anthon against Anthon squarly, that settles him, then place Dalzal, Kuhner, Andrews, Groves, Kouma, Gazes, and a host of others who give besprinkle, sprinkle, (*brecho*) for *bapto*, and Origen, and the host we read on *bapto* to-day, to keep company.

And now, on the versions, these most perfect witnesses here, look at the facts. You must remember that lexicographers have been and are largely dependent on ancient versions for their definitions of Greek, Hebrew and Syriac words. They are their greatest source of information, were the main and almost only source, till comparative philology was studied. We have seen that the old Itala, Jerome, Syriac, Ethiopic, etc., render *bapto* sprinkle—Rev xix. 13.

We have seen learned Greek fathers do so. We have seen that learned Greeks in Constantine's day translated *bapto* by *rantidzo*—Mark vii. 4. The two oldest manuscript Bibles in the world to-day, over fifteen hundred and fifty years old, do. Euthymius, a learned Greek father of the fourth century, translates *baptidzo* by *rantidzo*, to sprinkle. Seven other ancient copies do so. The reason they all render that one place—Mark vii. 4—thus, is, it was an added and superstitious Jewish baptism, always performed simply by sprinkling, no other way at all, and hence they, in transcribing, did what oft copyists did, translate the word into what expressed it exactly. They did not even like to recognize that under the name of the word for their solemn ordinance, and hence they tell us exactly what the daily Jewish baptism was—sprinkling. We

saw that the Arabic, in the golden age of their learning, translates *baptidzo* by three words—*amad* (*amadi*) *gasala* and *tzevaga* (*tzeva*). The first of these is never immerse by the Arabic lexicons. It applies to such affusions as wetting with rain, dew; sprinkle with water, perfusion.

Yet it habitually translates *baptidzo* in the New Testament when they read Greek familiarly, and translated Homer, Plato and Aristotle for the masses.

Then *gasala*, to wash, never, never means dip, no more than *ameda*, never is rendered dip or immerse by any authority on earth we ever saw. It means to wash, cleanse, bedew, perfuse, besprinkle; it translates *baptidzo* and its nouns in a number of places in the New Testament.

Then we saw that Rabbi Furst defined *tzeva* by "moisten, sprinkle, baptize." And here once more we assert that Dr. G. never heard one word from any respectable source against Furst in his life. He stood till his death lately at the head of the scholarship of the world, WITHOUT A PEER IN the colleges. It is the rule with immersionists to traduce those they cannot meet. Castell gives pour out (*effudit* as one of its meanings. The great Hebrew scholar of the fourth century, Jerome, translates *tzeva* sprinkle just half the times it occurs in the Old Testament, wet the other two. This word primarily means aspersion, to trickle in drops, etc. It applies in Arabic to sap dropping from cuts in a tree or vine. This word of affusion translates *baptidzo* about thirty-eight times in the New Testament.

Then comes the grand old Peshito, terror to all immersionists now. This word *amad*, which Dr. Graves admits is the same as the Arabic, as clearly it is, this word that only means immerse derivatively, and never occurs thus in the New Testament, this word that translates *louo*, twice from the Greek in Susanna, ch. I, ver 17, etc., *louo*, that whenever it is modal is pour, sprinkle, which his own Liddell and Scott to day, in their English edition defines "pour, (water for washing)," which Galen, the learned native Greek lexicographer of the second century, defines sprinkle, pour, this word is translated *amad* in Syriac. Yet this Syriac word *amad*, sprinkle, wet

with rain, it translates *baptidzo* constantly in the New Testament, in the apostolic age, in the best, the purest, the most literal version ever made on earth. What more do we want? What else could we want? No wonder David is translated in this version as saying, "My couch have I baptized with tears." It is not astonishing that Ezekiel is translated as saying, "Thou art the land that is not baptized! no, upon thee the rain has not fallen." That the woman "began to baptize Christ's feet with her tears," and he turns to her and says, "My feet hath she baptized with her tears."—*Time out.*

DR. GRAVES' SIXTEENTH SPEECH.

Argument from the Ancient Versions.

MR. PRESIDENT:—In introducing my argument from the ancient versions in support of immersion being the native, literal signification of the Greek verb *baptidzo*, I wish to preface it with the remark, that from them we can learn the accepted *usus loquendi*—the current and primary meaning—of any word in the age the version was made, at least, what it was understood to mean by the translators. We may then regard them as only second in authority to the writings of the Greeks themselves.

The Septuagint.

The first version, made of the Hebrew of the Old Testament, that has come down to us, was translated by seventy learned Jews, who thoroughly understood their own mother tongue and the Greek language, from the Hebrew into Greek in the third century before Christ.

Touching the use of the term *baptidzo* and *bapto* in the Old Testament, I quote Dr. Horne's second rule :

"All the significations formerly given to Hebrew words are to be considered correctly given which the Septuagint or other Greek translators express by the same or similar Greek words, although no trace of such meaning appears in any oriental language" [as Sanskrit or Syriac].—*Horne's Intro.*, p. 334.

My first argument from the Septuagint is this:

1. In Hebrew, the word *taval*, signifies "to dip, "to immerse," and is the term as generally used to express the act of putting under or into, as the verb *to dip*, in our language.

Now, the seventy, in translating this term into Greek, one instance excepted, universally used the Greek verbs *bapto* and *baptidzo*, and never by a verb signifying "to sprinkle" or "to pour; therefore, in the estimation of these seventy learned

Jewish scholars, who, it cannot be doubted, understood their own mother tongue and were thoroughly conversant with the Greek language as spoken and written three hundred and fifty years before Christ, *bapto* and *baptidzo* were synonyms of the Hebrew word *taval*, which never properly means "to sprinkle" or "to pour," but invariably "to dip," "to immerse," "to overwhelm." The one exception is in Genesis, where they use *moluno*, "to dye," "to stain," to indicate the act of coloring Joseph's coat:

"And they took Joseph's coat, and killed a kid of the goats, and dipped the coat in the blood," etc.

Now, let it be remembered that *moluno* no more means to "sprinkle" or "to pour upon" than *bapto* or *baptidzo* does, but is here used metaphorically by the translators, not in the original, the effect being put for the act that produced it. The Holy Spirit designates the act by which they colored the coat, "they dipped it in the blood of a kid," while the translators only express the effect, "they dyed," etc.

The Seventy in no single instance employed *raino*, or *perri-raino*, or *rantidzo*, or *cheo*, or *encheo*, or *epicheo*, or *proscheo*, or *katacheo*, or *enchuno*, or any term that undoubtedly signifies "to sprinkle," or "to pour" as a proper, or even figurative, signification of *taval* which, all scholars and all Jews agree, signifies only "to dip" or "immerse." If they ever so used it let the defendant point out the instance. If he cannot, then the Septuagint version, it must be admitted, sustains my position. One particular example I wish you all specially to notice—i. e., the case of the leprous Naaman, 2 Kings :

"And Elisha sent a messenger unto him, saying, 'Go and wash in Jordan seven times, and thy flesh shall come again to thee, and thou shalt be clean.'"

The prophet told him to go and wash (*rachats*) himself seven times in the river Jordan! Now, Dr. Altung and the most learned rabbins tell us, that invariably in the Hebrew purifications where *rachats*, "to wash," is spoken of, either of the clothes or of the person, the whole body must be immersed in water. Now, the Septuagint reads :

"Naaman kai abaptisonto en to- Jordane."

Can the most prejudiced anti-immersionist before me doubt for a moment that *baptidzo* indicated an immersion here?

Now, what would you Pedobaptists think of me should I try to prove to you, in the face of these facts, that Naaman did not dip himself in the river Jordan or even go into the water, but that he only went near the river, on the bank, and his servant went down and brought up some water in a pitcher, and he sprinkled or poured it upon himself seven times, to fulfill the prophet's command to bathe in the river? You would say that I most evidently perverted the plain word of God and should be discountenanced as an honest teacher. If there is a scholar, or a commentator, or teacher on the wide earth who presumes to make such a rendering in this case I have not heard of him, and hope I never may, for the honor of the human race. But, MARK *well*, the selfsame arguments employed by some, and they are the same few controversialists I referred to above, of *a very recent date*, to keep Christ out of the river Jordan, will keep Naaman out also, and they can be no more honest in the one case than in the other. Understand me, I do not presume to say that my opponent will stoop to such unscholarly and unchristian sophistries as would teach his people that Naaman was sprinkled seven times (*en to Jordane*) with the river Jordan, and not in it—no; but should he do so, I cannot modify my position.

Now, as certainly as the Greek of the Septuagint indicates, without a doubt, that Naaman immersed himself in the river Jordan, just so certainly does the Greek of the New Testament indicate and declare that Christ was immersed by John in the selfsame river. Compare the two records:

“Naaman *kai ebaptisonto en to Jordane*.”—2 Kings v. 14.

“Jesus *kai ebaptishe apo Joahnon eis ton Jordanen*.”—Mark i. 9.

And as certainly were the people whom John baptized immersed in the Jordan as was Naaman. Read the record:

“*Kai ebaptizonto en to Jordane*.”—Matt. iii. 6.

One can with no more reason or honesty deny the one of these cases than the other.

The testimony of the Septuagint version—which is the con-

joint testimony of seventy learned Jews, and impartial witnesses they were—is that *baptidzo* signifies “to immerse,” and only “to immerse.”

2. There were two other versions of the Old Testament, into Greek, made between the latter half of the first and the middle of the second centuries, and both of these translate *taval* invariably by *bapto* and *baptidzo*, never by *raino*, *echeo*, *brecho*, or any verb that means to sprinkle or to pour, never.

Peschito—Simple Syriac-Version.

It is *now* in order, and it has not before been in order for either my opponent or myself, to speak of the Syriac Version. This version has been almost the song and the chorus of my learned friend from his first to his last speech. You have been led to believe, if you believe his oft-repeated assertions—

1. That this version, and not the Greek of the evangelists, is in the very language in which Christ taught the people, and gave the commission to his apostles, and—

2. That it was made in the life-time of the apostles, if not by them or their immediate disciples, and—

3. That it is of equal, if not superior authority, in settling this act of baptism to the inspired Greek text of the New Testament, and—

4. Finally, that the Syriac unquestionably determines the baptismal act to have been a “sprinkling” or a “pouring,” or “standing up,” but not an “immersion,” never.

Now, I am prepared to show you that not one of these positions is true, and that all the ado that has been made these past four days about the Syriac Version, has been to impress you with the extent of his familiarity with the language, beyond this, “*Vox et preterea nihil.*”

1. It is evident to me that Christ spoke the language in which the New Testament was written, because the most universally used and understood. Dean Alford in the last edition of his Notes, concedes the Gospels were written in Greek.

“On the whole, then, I find myself constrained to abandon the idea maintained in my first edition, and to adopt that of a Greek original.”

The learned Wm. Steiger was professor in the theological school of Geneva, during a part of the present century. His lectures or General Introduction were published at Geneva in 1837, after his death. Concerning them the editor says, "That in them the last discoveries are summed up, the last systems are mentioned." And yet, without knowing anything about it, Eld. Ditzler contemptuously speaks of this work as "some old book."

Steiger, who ought to be supposed to know something of these matters, says:

"The Peschito was made for the use of the churches of the *interior* of Syria only, because near the sea, (on which Palestine bordered), *the Greek was spoken.*"

The Greek language was the most universally spoken language. Cicero said of it:

"While the Latin tongue is spoken only in a few places, and by comparatively few people, the Greek tongue is used throughout the known world."

If Christ spoke the language that was the best understood, and by the largest numbers, he spoke the Greek, and for this very reason the Holy Spirit selected the Greek.

It is noticeable that whenever the Savior used a Syriac phrase the evangelists translated it into Greek, which is opposed to the idea that he spoke in Syriac altogether, *e. g.*, "*talathi cumi.*" "*Eloi, Eloi lama sabachthani.*"

2. Nor was it made by the apostles, nor in their life time, nor by their immediate disciples.

We have already seen there was no use for it until Christianity had penetrated into the interior of Syria, and the Greek had ceased to be universally spoken by the people, long after the death of the apostles.

Those who have had some special purpose to serve by the use of this Syriac Version, as my opponent has, have ever been wont, as he has from day to day, to extol the Syriac above all that's written, reminding me of the language of Bishop Horne in his Introduction to the Critical Study of the Scriptures:

"The most extravagant assertions have been advanced concerning the antiquity of the Peschito Version."

Inasmuch as Eld. Ditzler has been going into ecstasies over the Syriac, I ask him here, with a good deal of emphasis, when was this translation made?

Reuss, of Strasburg, and Scholton, of Leyden, unite in giving a very sensible reply, and that is, "that we have no means of accurately knowing," (*Die Zeit, in der sie entstand, ist nicht genau festzustellen*).

Steiger, in his General Introduction to the New Testament, without venturing his own opinion, says, "It is believed to have been made about the year A. D. 200." But Dr. Arnold, of Halle, in Herzog's Religious Encyclopedia, 22 vols., who planted himself on the facts, remarks, that *the first historic proof of the existence of this version* is found in the works of Ephraim the Syrian. (I omit the German, though I have it here.) And when, pray, did this Ephraim live? Not till the eighth decade of the fourth century, A. D. 380.

This, Mr. President, is the version which my learned friend says was made almost under the very eyes of the apostles, in the apostolic age, and is fully equal if not superior to the text that was inspired by the Holy Spirit!!

But, sir, his reason for so doing is obvious enough. He desires to give this translation all the weight of authority he possibly can, in order to be the better able to transfer to *baptidzo* what he supposes to be the meaning, or meanings, of *amad*.

It may well be doubted whether it is proper to attach so much *critical* value to the Syriac translation as my opponent has done. He appears to regard it as a thing of perfection. Hear what Steiger, whom we have already quoted on another point, says of this version :

"This translation is unequal, sometimes it adheres to the letter, sometimes it is a little paraphrastic."

I hope that these considerations will lead Eld. Ditzler to esteem his Greek Testament, God's Word, above the Peschito Version, made by fallible man. I say all this not to undervalue or to impeach the Syriac, but to vindicate the honor of God's word.

And now, what about *amad*? I promised my opponent that

I would, in due time, come to this favorite *word* of his. Respecting its meaning he has already delivered himself a full score of times daily, from the first day. I hope he is satisfied and will patiently listen to what I have to say on this *subsidiary* matter.

The Syriac language has a verb for "sprinkle," viz., *ras*, and this is found Hebrews ix. 19; and it is followed by the preposition *al*, "he sprinkled upon the book and upon the people." This is the full rendering of the Syriac. The same root is found in its noun form in the same epistle xi. 28: "Through faith he kept the passover and the sprinkling of blood." But this, mark it, is not the word used in connection with the ordinance of baptism anywhere in the Syriac Version.

So, too, we discover in the Syriac New Testament a word for to pour, *eshad*. Schindler gives as its meaning, *fudit*, *effudit*. This is its primary and general signification. It is employed in the Peschito version in Acts ii. 17: "I will pour out my Spirit on all flesh," etc. And again, Matt. xxii. 35: "All the righteous blood shed upon the earth." But this is not the word that renders *baptidzo*. But this word is never used to translate *baptidzo* in the Syriac Version.

Then, again, the Syriac has an appropriate verb for wash—*i. e.*, *secho*. Let the learned take their Syriac Testaments and turn to Acts xvi. 33: "He took them the same hour of the night and washed (*secho*) their stripes." And in Hebrews x. 22: "And our bodies washed with pure water." But this word is never used in the Syriac to render *baptidzo*. *Tseva* also means sometimes "to wash" secondarily.

Tseva or *tsebæ*, signifies "to dip," but this verb, like *bapto* in Greek, is never used to translate *baptidzo*, in the Syriac.

Amad signifies "to dip," "to immerse," and is the verb invariably used to translate *baptidzo*. What is the literal meaning of this verb? is now the question before us.

Some have supposed that *amad* signifies "to purify," but we find in Syriac another word for this, *deka*, defined in Castell's Polyglotta, *purificavit*, *mundavit*, etc., and is rendered in the English version, Matt. xi. 5, "and the lepers are cleansed." But *deka* does not express the action *baptidzo*.

Then, again, there has been a conjecture that *amad* means "to confirm," as though it favored Episcopal confirmation. But there is a Syriac word meaning "to confirm." That verb is *shar*, defined by Castell, *confirmatus est* and *stabilivit*, and is so rendered Acts xiv. 21: "Confirming the souls of the disciples."

I might go on with similar instances, but sufficient induction of cases has been made. Here are words denoting these specific actions, but no one of these is ever used to render the word *baptidzo* in the New Testament. But we have in the Syriac no word that means specifically "to dip" or "immerse," thus answering to *baptidzo* of the New Testament, at least, so says my worthy opponent! Now, I affirm here squarely that this word *amad*, which is always employed in the Peschito to render *baptidzo*, means "to dip," "immerse," never properly "to sprinkle" any more than our "to dip" means "to sprinkle."

Lexical Authorities.

I now propose to give you every standard lexicon and critical authority touching the meaning of the word *amad*, which the Syrian translators invariably employed to translate *baptidzo*, and its cognates, and thereby end the discussion upon it, if possible, in all coming years. I pay this attention to this version because my opponent and some others so pervert its meaning and use in order to force it to sustain sprinkling:

CASTELL (Lex. Heptaglott, 1669,) defines *amad* by "*ablutus est, baptizatus est immersit*, to bathe, baptize, immerse."

MICHAELIS (Lex. Syr., 1788,) by the very same terms, and adds, that it comes from the Arabic *ghamat*, to immerse, and not from the Hebrew *amad*, to stand.

SCHAAF (Lex. Syr., 1708,) defines *amad*, "*ablutus se ablutus intinctus, immersus in aquam, baptizatus est*, to wash one's self, to wash, to dip, to immerse in water."

GUIDO FABRICIUS (Lex. Syr. Chal., 1592,) defines it, "*baptizavit, intingit, lavit*, baptize, dip, bathe."

SCHINDLER (Lex. Pentaglott, 1612,) defines it, *baptizatus, in aquam immersus, tinctus, lotus fuit*, to baptize, to immerse into water, to dip, bathe."

BUXTORFF, (Lex. Chal. et Syr., 1622,) gives "*baptizari, intingi, abluere*, to baptize, dip in, to wash," etc.

GUTBIER, in his lexicon attached to his edition of the Syriac New Testament, defines *amad*, "*baptizavit, baptizatus est*, to immerse, to be immersed."

DR. GOTCH, an Episcopalian and a thorough orientalist, after the most critical examination, says: "*Amad* in Syriac signifies *to immerse*, never to stand, much less to sprinkle."

BAR ALI, Syrian, A. D. 885, quoted by Dr. Davis of Regent's Park College, London:

"*Amad* (in different forms): (1) An immersion, a bathing, a dipping. (2) He was immersed, he was baptized. (3) Baptism or immersion. (4) Pillar, column, pillar of light. (5) He who dives or bathes."

The testimony of another lexicon by Bar-Bahlul, who flourished in the tenth century, is also given, and is substantially the same.

BERNSTEIN'S.—"*Amad*, (1) he was dipped, immersed; he dipped, or plunged himself into something. 'It plunged itself (*amad*) into the depth of the sea.' 'The point of the arrow sank into his brain.' *Figuratively*, the day dipped itself, *i. e.*, it waned, it disappeared. (2) To be bathed, washed, immersion in water. (3) He was initiated by means of the sacred bath, he was baptized. *Aphel*, (Greek, *baptein, baptizein*,) (1) he dipped, immersed; (2) bathed, washed; (3) baptized." See his *Lexicon Syriacum* to Kirsch's *Syriac Chrestomathy* and the references under the word.

Can it be questioned by any fair minded person, that *amad* means "to immerse," "to dip?" If standard lexicons can settle any question they settle this, that its proper meaning is "to dip," "to immerse."

The use Made of the Syriac Verb for the Act of Baptism in the New Testament.

DR. GOTCH, in his very learned and valuable "Examination," gives in substance the following results:

"That the Syriac verb *amad* and its derivatives, are employed for the Greek verb *baptidzo*, and its derivatives in one hundred and twenty instances; and the noun *maaduthito* (which signifies both baptism and baptistery) is used four times for *kolumbethra*—a swimming pool (John v. 2, 4, 7 and ix 7), and twice for *photisthentes*—having been enlightened (Heb. vi, 4, x, 32,) [*i. e.*, having descended into the baptistery.]

It must be evident to the reader from the above summary of results, that the Syriac verb *amad* meant, in the estimation of the translator, or translators of the Syriac New Testament, something very different from sprinkling, pouring on, stand-

ing up. The noun derived from it could not have denoted a bathing place or a swimming pool, unless the verb conveyed the idea of bathing or immersion. The verb is used in Mark vii. 4, and Luke xi. 38, for the taking of a bath, and the noun also in the former passage for the immersion of vessels and different utensils for the sake of purifying them.

The same verb is used in Luke xii. 50, Mark x. 38, 39, and Matt. xx. 22, where the sufferings of Christ are spoken of, and the idea of sinking in a flood of afflictions, or of being overwhelmed with them, is expressed.

Those of our readers who remember the description of baptism by Justin Martyr, quoted in a former speech, will not be surprised at such a rendering as that of Heb. vi. 4, in the Syriac version: "Those who once went down to baptism" for "Those who were once enlightened." Infant baptism being unknown in the first and second centuries, the early Christians called baptism *illumination*, because the candidates were supposed to be enlightened in their minds by the word and grace of God. (Apologia i. sec. 61.)

Now, if Eld. Ditzler has such a profound respect for the Syriac, why will he not implicitly bow to its plain teachings on these texts? And the best of all, this "grand old Syriac Version" supports my position that Romans vi. 4, refers to water baptism!

Instances of the Syriac Word for Baptism in Other Writings than the New Testament.

Numbers xxxi. 23: "All that abideth not the fire, ye shall plunge it (Syriac, *amad*) in water." It is also in the Apocrypha in Judith xii. 6, and in Susanna xiii. 15, for to bathe, or immerse one's self, for which the Seventy have *baptidzo* and *louo* in the middle voice.

Dr. Gotch adduces instances from Christian writers of the use of this verb for immersion. Ephraim Syrus, who flourished in the fourth century, speaks of Christ as having been baptized (*amad*) in the river. "How wonderful is it," he says in another place, "that Thy footsteps were planted on the waters; that the great sea should subject itself to Thy feet; and yet at

a small river that same head of Thine should be subjected to be bowed down and baptized (*amad*) in it!" As the waters of the sea were placed under the feet of Christ, so his head was placed under the flood of the Jordan.

In the Nestorian Ritual, compiled about A. D. 650, the priest is represented as taking the child and dipping (Syriac, *tsebae* or *tseva*) him in the water, and saying, "Such an one is baptized (Syriac, *amad*) in the name of the Father, etc., and then causing him to ascend from the water." In this ritual, the verb, *amad* is used interchangeably with *tsebae*, which has no other meaning but to immerse. In the Syriac Chrestomathy, to which Bernstein's Lexicon is attached, p, 209, the verb is used by Bar-Ihebræas of the leviathan of Job xli. 1, "plunging (*amad*) in the depth of the sea." The same verb is used in the same sense in Book i., sec. 17, of the Theophania of Eusebius, written about A. D. 411, and translated thus by the late Professor Lee, of Cambridge: "This selfsame Word of God also immersed (*amad*) even into the depths of the sea, and determined those swimming natures," etc. Surely the "standing and sprinkling ceremony" of my opponent would not suit these passages.

Baptism Among the Syrians and Nestorians.

The Syrian sect called Zabæans, Mendæans, or Disciples of St. John, baptize by immersion. The name Zabæans is derived, according to Neander, from the Syriac verb *tsebae*, "to dip," and they are so called from their manner of baptizing. Dr. Wall says that all the Christians of Asia and Africa, and one-third of those of Europe, baptize by immersion (Hist. of Inf. Baptism, vol. ii., p. 414; Robinson's Hist. of Baptism, pp. 117-124.)

That the baptismal act among the Syrians at the time, as it was ever after the Syriac version was made, was only by immersion, there can be no doubt. I hold in my hand a copy of the *Baptist Sentinel*, containing an article on baptism among the Syrians, written some years ago by my learned friend, Rev. Geo. Varden, D. D. Ph. D., of Kentucky, one of the ripest oriental scholars in the South. Time will not permit me to

read this interesting article, which clearly settles the question that the practice of the Syrians was to immerse, and that no other mode was recognized among them. He brings forward the fact that in the third century there was a large building for the purpose of immersion erected in connection with the mother church at Edessa, the capital of the nation, and that this building, capable of holding a large concourse of people, contained a pool like unto a large bathing vat, and this house was called *maaduthito*, a baptistery. Only one question need to be asked, why this house, and why this pool, unless their custom was to baptize by immersion? It was never built for any other purpose, certainly not to afford drinking-water for the crowds that came to witness sprinkling! *Maaduthito* is a derivative of *amad*, and determines its meaning to have been to immerse, to dip.

The present mode of baptizing among the Nestorians, is a proof that the Syriac *amad* means to *immerse*. Let it be borne in mind that it is the Syriac language which they speak. "The language of the Nestorians, says Dr. Perkins, an eminent American missionary amongst them, "a modern dialect of the Syriac, is derived as directly from that venerable tongue, as the modern Greek from the ancient." (Journal of the S. L., 1853, p. 382). The Revs. G. P. Badger, in his "Nestorians and their Ritual," Thos. Laurie, in his "Life of Dr. Grant," and Smith and Dwight, in their "Missionary Researches," speak of their language as Syriac. When two of their teachers visited London in 1862, it was by means of the Syriac that they were able to hold intercourse with Englishmen, the Rev. B. H. Cowper acting as interpreter. It is the Syriac-Scriptures that they use. Dr. Grant distributed the Scriptures amongst them in the ancient Syriac as well as in the Syro Chaldaic, or Syriac in Nestorian characters. But they baptize by immersion and employ the Syriac *amad* to denote the act, their ritual being the same in this respect as the one already referred to, (Badger's "Nestorians," vol. ii, pp. 207, 208, ed. 1852; Smith and Dwight's "Missionary Researches in Armenia," p. 382). Could this have been the case if *amad* meant to *sprinkle*, to *pour*, or to stand up?

The idea of sprinkling, pouring or standing up is inconsistent with the declaration of the Syriac version of the New Testament.

Paul looks on baptism as an emblem of burial and resurrection; Rom. vi, 4: Col. ii, 12. But how could the Christians be buried by means of baptism, and raised again, if Christ used a word for the ordinance which meant to *scatter, diffuse, or stand upright, like a pillar*? If it meant either of these how could the descent of Israel into the Red Sea, and their being buried out of sight in the cloud and in the sea, and their emerging on the other side, be compared to baptism? How could the noun ever have been used for a swimming-pool, if it means sprinkling, or one taking his stand, or standing erect? Would the Syrian translator on that supposition have rendered Hel. vi, 4, "*Who have once descended into the baptistery*," if the Syriac word for baptism meant to sprinkle, to pour, or to stand erect? The inconsistencies and absurdities of the theory are a sufficient refutation of it.

But it has been urged by Stuart and others that there is a verb in the Syriac that unquestionably means to dip into, *tsebæ* (or, as my opponent writes it, *tseva*), and if a specific mode was intended, why was not this used? My reply is that *tsebæ* does not more certainly point to the act of immersion than does *amad*, and had it been chosen, the same, or some greater difficulty would have been found with it. How is it with the Hebrew? Sprinklers ask why was not *tava* instead of *taval* chosen to indicate immersion definitely? How is it in Greek? They say that *bapto* should have been selected instead of *baptidzo* to indicate an undoubted immersion? And yet, my philological friend has spent days in attempting to prove that *bapto* even, means to sprinkle, to pour, to wet in any way! There is the verb to dip, in English, clearly implying a putting under and taking out again, and yet we universally prefer the verb to immerse, which only means to put under. It is simply impossible to please them. There is not a verb in any language under heaven meaning to dip, to immerse, that Eld. Ditzler cannot, by the magical and absurd way he deals with *bapto*, *baptidzo*, and *amad*, make them primarily mean to *sprinkle*, not one. Our own English word to *dip*, means secondarily to sprinkle, to wet, to moisten.

Augusti and Dr. B. Davies suggest, "the reason why the translators of the Syriac version did not select *tsebæ* instead of *amad*, may possibly have been that *tsebæ* had been already appropriated by the Zabæans or Hemero-baptists, a half Jewish sect, supposed to have come down from John the Baptist. The Syrian Christians would naturally wish not to be confounded with a religious sect with which they had no communion, and hence might have adopted another equally appropriate term to denote the baptismal act."

I have now fulfilled my promise, and met every one of my opponent's arguments drawn from the Syriac to oppose immersion as the practice of the early Syrian Christians in the days of Christ and the apostles. The Syriac version, as I told you, not only gives sprinkling no aid or comfort, but is a most *weighty* and conclusive argument against him and his sprinkling *tradition*. Where now lingers the terror inspired the first days of this discussion in the breasts of the multitude by those huge books? Every line of them, if only faithfully translated, is in support of immersion as the only act commanded by Christ or practiced by the apostles for Christian baptism. As it has been agreed to refer any further discussions on versions to an Appendix, I will say this in conclusion, touching versions. The Syriac, nor any other *version* of the sacred text, is a rule to us. Whatever versions or translations *may* teach, they are not our infallible guides, and their renderings are not binding upon us. The inspired writings of the prophets, and the apostles, and the other holy writers in the original tongues, are our ultimate appeal and highest authority, and not translations, however excellent and venerable. The word used in the Greek Testament, and selected by Christ and the Holy Spirit to designate the act of baptism is *baptidzo*; and to ascertain its real, current and generally accepted meaning among the Greek-speaking nations in the days of Christ, and those most familiar with the Greek language in every age has been my honest effort.

I close this argument in the language of a noble brother, battling in the same cause across the seas:

"Is not the word divinely chosen, a word which for many hundreds of years before, and for hundreds of years after, the commencement of the Christian era, has evidently been used by Greek writers when they intended to designate immersion and invariably to designate nothing less-

than immersion? 'If the Head of the church had designed to use a term prescribing immersion as specifically as possible, does the Greek language afford another word as specific as *baptidzo*? Is it not grossly deceiving the readers of Pedobaptist publications to teach that both in classic and sacred literature we find baptism including almost every conceivable application of water?' And is it honorable, in the presence of existing facts to represent it as "probable, though not quite certain, that baptize in the New Testament signifies to immerse?"—Ingham, *Hand Book of Baptism*, p. 69.

His impotent attempt to justify his use of Schleusner, I must reserve for my next speech, as I see the gavel rising—(*Time out*).

DR. DITZLER'S SIXTEENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS :—It seems to me, that after four days' debate, we should have settled the question of the testimony of the Greek lexicons and their value, but here, the fifth and last day on this question, still finds us contesting this point. I presume this will be the last time we will have them up now. Let me state concisely and pointedly the merit of the Greek lexicon question.

1. We presented some twenty-five lexical authorities on *baptidzo*, all of whom (1) gave wash, cleanse, and such definitions to this word as New Testament meanings. (2) All of them gave either sprinkle, pour, or both, else a word like *brecho*, of "affusion," as equivalent to both. See Sophocles. He gave "ablution, bathe, (baptize) in tears," which is affusion.

Then six more, Budæus, 1519, Stephanus, 1572, Scapula, 1579, Passow, Hedericus, and Schrevellius, and many others, all being abridgments of Stephanus, or of abridgments of him. He adopts Budæus on *baptidzo*.

1. These were out and out immersionist lexicons; by men dipped in their own baptism, under a queen who was dipped, under laws requiring dipping, though Budæus and Stephanus lived in France.

3. They render *baptidzo*, in its classic use, by sink and overwhelm, not dip.

3. They gave *lavo*, *abluo*, as its only New Testament sense—wash, besprinkle, cleanse.

4. It was immersionists who had the giving of a strong bias that way in the lexicography of the Greek. Despite all that the facts are so crushing that we thus have the whole lexicography of all ages and nations with us. Here then thirty odd lexicons are with us and solid against our opponent.

We then turn to A. Campbell, and in all his research he

could not find *baptidzo* meaning dip a single time. He found *bapto* meaning dip often—so rendered it—but never this word. We saw Conant, out of sixty-three consecutive cases, render it by whelm, and overwhelm fifty-three times, all being cases of affusion, however, copious—application of the element to the subject—not once dip. This is the record of the two most noted immersionist writers America ever produced. But dip is the word you want. Dipping is your ceremony. You don't immerse, sink, the object; you dip him. Ingham, out of one hundred and sixty-nine cases, thinks he has one case—renders it dip once.

Now, why this ado about lexicons, when Ingham has it "overwhelm" fifty times, "dip" only once? You see inconsistency at every step. Passow is right, therefore, in saying: "Generally to sprinkle upon, pour upon, pour over (or overwhelm)," etc. He is really sustained by all Baptist writers of note, and they heed it not.

Then came our classic exhibition, and we showed that for centuries *baptidzo* was used in no other sense than affusion, even from five hundred and twenty-two years before Christ till Polybius; that these facts pointed to an earlier, remoter use; all by aspersion. He has never dared to notice these facts for a moment. We backed it all by elaborately extended texts in philology. We showed the universal principles and laws of language; how meanings are derived, and how they are discovered; how the primary can be discovered and proved. He has paid no attention here. We showed, that by the universal laws of language, *baptidzo* primarily meant to sprinkle.

We took the meanings all admit it has and tested them by established facts, and we found those meanings could not be derived from immerse as a primary meaning.

1. We have now traced *baptidzo* from its first appearance in Greek till before Christ 384, covering one hundred and thirty-eight years.

2. During this period it occurs only in a metaphorical sense. No instance of a literal use as yet occurs.

3. It points, therefore, to an earlier literal use, as all metaphorical uses are based on a preceding literal use. A metaphorical meaning often comes to be the current meaning, and a literal one, as was shown.

4. *Baptidzo*, in every case, implied affusion, never dip, never immerse; and no lexicon ever made gives dip or immerse as a meaning earlier than Polybius. That is a late iron age writer.

5. In every case, as yet, the baptizing element is applied to the object, and not the object put into it.

FIRST LITERAL USE.

We now come to the first occurrence of *baptidzo* in a literal sense, in Aristotle, B. C. 384. It occurs only once in him. "Certain places full of rushes and seaweed, which, when it is ebb-tide, are not overflowed (*baptizesthai*), but at full-tide are overflowed (*katakluzesthai*)."

Notice here, now.

1. This is the first occurrence of the word in a literal sense. It is very important, therefore, in determining the earlier and primary meaning. We see that Jahn, Fairbairn, Gesenius, Havernich, and all authorities know nothing of Dr. Graves' new idea of primary. We see that Liddell and Scott can never settle long enough on any one meaning to let it "cool," till they find they are wrong, and change it. And as Dr. Graves and his Baptist brother, Prof. Toy, tell us lexicons "are authoritative and valuable only as they establish meanings given by quotations from approved authors," here we are appealing to such authors. By the way, why do not Liddell and Scott cite this greatest of all Greeks? Evidently they did not know that he used the word.

2. It is by the greatest and most accurate of all Greek scholars that ever lived.

3. There is no immerse here. This is out of the question. The land was not dipped into the water.

4. The baptizing element came upon the object baptized. That is clear.

5. Our law of philology is sustained. As Stuart and A. Campbell say *baptidzo* and *katakluzo* are here used in exactly the same sense. Now, let us examine *kluzo*, and see its primary meaning.

The Glosses give on *perikluzo*, sprinkle (*adspergo pertundo*). Passow.—“*Kluzo*. Wash, bedash, wet,” etc.

Budæus and Stephanus.—*Periklusmati*. ‘Sprinkle (*aspergine*). Clyster is the noun from it.”

Graves.—“*Perikluzo*. To wash all round or all over, dash water, sprinkle all over,” etc.

The primary force is to besprinkle with force, bedash, as when there is force used in dashing the water in one’s face, in one’s ears, eyes, or on the body.

It is often compounded with *kata* and *peri*, as *bapto* and *baptidzo* are.

Here we see a word that primarily means to besprinkle, dash water on any one, infuse it into the ear (see Liddell and Scott), comes to mean the same, and is exactly equivalent to *baptidzo* in the first occurrence of that word in a literal sense, so far as Greek literature has preserved it. *Kluzo* like its companion, *baptidzo* in later Greek, came to mean submerge, especially in compound forms, the primary meaning, to sprinkle.

Eubulus, B. C. 380, next uses it once—doubtful in its meaning.

Evenus of Paros, about B. C. 250, uses it once. “Wine baptizes with stupor, or sleep (*hypno*).”

1. From Pindar to this poet are two hundred and seventy-two years, and not once does *baptidzo* occur, as yet, meaning to dip, to immerse. We know that not only poets like Young, but Italian and Greek poets speak of pouring “delicious slumbers on mine eyes.”

2. In all cases affusion is pointed out. Here we have done what all agree is the only reliable way, inspect the passages.

3. We saw that *bapto*, the root, exhibited the same facts; all pointed out sprinkle as the primary meaning of the word, and a continued meaning through centuries after Christ.

A SUMMARY OF FACTS AND PHILOLOGY.

1. Dr. Graves and Carson, Gale, Conant, A. Campbell, all appeal from lexicography to the *usus loquendi*, and seek for the primary meaning.

2. We saw that from 522 B. C. till 205 B. C., Polybius' birth, *baptidzo* always implied affusion, never once meaning to dip, plunge or immerse.

3. All the laws of language demonstrate that the process in the development of meaning is from sprinkle, to wet, moisten, pour, wash; from pouring water came wash, overflow, overwhelm, sink, drown. They never reverse that order.

4. We appeal to words properly meaning to immerse, to dip, and they never have the meanings *bapto* and *baptidzo* are universally admitted to have. The Hebrew *tabha*, *kaphash*, *shapo*; the Greek *enduno*, *kataduo*, *pontidzo*, *buthidzo*, *katapon-tidzo*, (*dupro*, dip; *kolumbao*, dip, dive); the Persic *ghuta*; Ethiopic *maab*, *maba*; the Arabic *gatta*, *gamara*, *amasa*, *gamasa*; the German *eintauchen*, *undertauchen*, *senken*; the Latin *mergo*, *immergo*, *demergo*, *submergo*, all mean to immerse, are the definite words in those languages in constant use in their literature. Yet never are they applied to abusing, aspersing or slandering pouring abuse on any one. They never mean to wash. They never mean to cleanse or purify. They never mean to overwhelm, overflow, intoxicate, make drunk. Let us be specific.

5. Not one of all these words means to asperse, abuse, pour abuse upon any one in literal or metaphorical use. *Baptidzo* often so occurs. Aspersing, abusing, never comes from words properly meaning to immerse, or dip. It does come from *baptidzo*, hence *baptidzo* never did primarily mean to dip, or immerse.

6. Words properly meaning to immerse never mean to intoxicate. *Baptidzo* does mean to intoxicate, therefore it does not primarily (or generally) mean to immerse. But words that do primarily mean to sprinkle, others to moisten, bedew, do come to mean to intoxicate. Hence, these facts demonstrate sprinkle, moisten, to be the primary force of *baptidzo*.

7. These words do not properly mean to "overwhelm"—never philologically take such a meaning. *Baptidzo* does mean "overwhelm" often—is so rendered by Ingham 50 times out of 169 cases; 10 times by A. Campbell on one half page. But words meaning to sprinkle, then to pour, constantly come to mean to "overwhelm," in all languages. Hence, sprinkle is demonstrated as the primary meaning of *baptidzo*.

8. Dr. Conant renders *baptidzo* "whelm" 45 times out of 63 consecutive occurrences. These words never mean to whelm. Whelm cannot be derived from dip. But is constantly a meaning of words that mean to sprinkle, pour, primarily. Hence, sprinkle is again demonstrated to be the primary meaning of *baptidzo*.

9. These words never come to mean "to overflow." *Baptidzo* does mean "to overflow" the first time it ever occurs in a literal sense, so far as found. Overflow does come from words meaning sprinkle, pour, hence, sprinkle is again demonstrated to be the primary meaning.

10. These words never mean to wash. *Baptidzo* does often mean to wash. Words primarily meaning to sprinkle, to pour, do mean—constantly come to mean to wash. Hence dip, immerse, never could have been the primary meaning of *baptidzo*, but sprinkle was. (1) There is no philological or necessary connection between immerse and wash. You may dip in filth, slime, corrupting elements; immerse in ink, mud, filthy pools, corroding elements, as well as water. (2) Wash as a meaning of *baptidzo* is older than immerse by from one hundred to one hundred and fifty years. Hence, cannot be derived from immerse as a meaning of *baptidzo*.

11. Drs. Gale, Ingham, Cox, Morell, Mell, all others admit that baptism is effected "by superfusion," that is pouring upon. But superfusion never can be derived from dip, or immerse. Hence these never were primary meanings of *baptidzo*.

12. *Baptidzo* meant "overflow" one hundred and seventy-nine years before it came to mean immerse. Hence, immerse is not a primary or even an early meaning of it.

13. It meant "to overwhelm" two hundred and twenty-two years before it meant to immerse; hence, immerse is a late meaning.

14. It meant asperse, and pour abuse upon people, three hundred and seventeen years before it meant immerse. Hence, immerse never was a primary meaning.

15. It is claimed that *baptidzo* means to dip, the thing they want. Dip cannot philologically come from *immerse*. The one leaves its object in, the other at once removes it—perfect opposites. Dip can be intensified into immerse, not immerse into dip.

16. All meanings belonging to *baptidzo*, or claimed for it, are derived meanings, and often prevailing later meanings of words primarily meaning to sprinkle, to moisten, where it was by affusion.

17. It is the law of words to intensify, not to grow feebler. Our word prevent, the Hebrew and Greek for pray, Greek and Hebrew for know, see and hosts of words, stand (*khum*), in Hebrew are a few examples out of scores and hundreds. Our fifty words showed it sufficiently.

18. Our whole body of words showed that it is the uniform course of language to develop the class of meanings found in *bapto* and *baptidzo*, always from aspersion to immersion, never from immersion to aspersion. Hence it is infallibly certain that sprinkle was the primary meaning of *baptidzo*.

As many facts of this kind apply to *bapto*, the root word, which all immersionists say has the same meaning as *baptidzo*, as the above. Words properly meaning to immerse never mean to stain, smear, paint nor dye. A mass of facts apply here.

In the face of these facts, how little do we care for Liddell and Scott's lexicon with its absurdities and changes? 1. It had bathe, moisten, drench, pour upon, steep "dip repeatedly," as the first in order. Then to "draw water" was a meaning. No sink, no immerse, was in it as late as 1851. Does that show accuracy, study? Does not *baptidzo* so often in iron age Greek mean to sink that he could not have failed to see it, had he

looked? You will think so at least. Now the very meaning you affirm was not in Liddell and Scott at all, but dip is repeated, though *baptidzo* never means dip. Hence we say Liddell and Scott in this word show less sense than any lexicon in existence. Yet it is the favorite with Baptists.

O, but "he changed it." Yes, he did change it. 1. He takes out "wet, pour upon." Baptists sleep easy now. 2. Ah, they find "pour" under *louo*, and it is full brother to *baptidzo*, and Baptists cannot sleep with such a traitor among their children in school. It is stricken out. Baptists snore loudly now, and dream sweetly. 3. A third alarm is sounded, "to dip repeatedly" won't do—out with that. It is stricken out. We will get this "crazy" lexicon right yet. Baptists feel good all over, and nod refreshingly. 4. A cry is heard, there is no immerse, our pet word immerse is not in that lexicon. It is changed again, and the Baptists rest well. "And still he turns, and turning, still cries, I at last will have my will—*der tzoph der hunght im hinten.*"

As Liddell and Scott figure so largely, let us turn to their preface and learn some facts from them. They can best tell us what they mean.

1. They tell us, Preface, xvii, that "for the most part we had only *spare hours* to bestow" on the work. The American editor tells us "his time was limited; the best portion of the day was wholly occupied with laborious professional duties, and he had, therefore, only the evenings and mornings to devote to the lexicons. This scanty allowance of time, with the tedious duty of proof-reading" offered little opportunity, etc. Preface to American Ed. viii, 9. Here we see the small amount of labor spent—the "scanty," "spare hours," "evenings and mornings of seven to eight years—only an average of a few moments to each word. In one lexicon we quoted, thirty solid years were spent by the greatest linguist of that century of linguists. In another, an aggregate of over *three hundred years* of constant toil and investigation. Passow spent years—his lifetime on his work, mainly only getting one-third of the lexicon finished. Hence he spent fifty times as much care and pains on the words as Liddell & Scott.

2. Liddell and Scott say (2 Pref. xx), their plan was to make each article "a history of the usage of the word referred to. That is, we have *always* sought to give the EARLIEST authority for its use first.

Now turn to his definition of *baptidzo* and he gives only three authorities for the word. Plato, alone, has the metaphorical meaning—"overwhelmed with questions" and "soaked in wine." Those meanings can never be derived from his first definition—"dip repeatedly, dip under." Now for *this* he goes way down in the *iron* age of Greek and does not give an authority earlier than that, and *no* authority for "dip repeatedly, dip under." The earliest he gives to support "dip a vessel" is Plutarch—long after the commission was given. Yet they (Liddell and Scott) say they "*always* sought to give the *earliest* authority for its use *first*." Now, then, this is "the earliest authority" they give for *dip* Plutarch. If "*current* use, if *usus loquendi* was the *primary* meaning, then *baptidzo* never meant dip in Liddell and Scott's estimation till long after the last Apostle was dead. That is too late.

But that is not all. Liddell and Scott tell us their manner of defining. After certain arrangements they say their order is—"Then the interpretation of the word, with examples, etc.," after Passow's style. Not a word about *primary* meanings being those first in order. They tell us "there are *few* words that do not change their significations more or less in the downward course of time. He then tells us a word occurs in Homer often only metaphorically, that occurs in a literal sense first in Plato. True, and just so it is of *baptidzo*—it occurring in a literal sense first in Aristotle. And now notice further what Liddell and Scott say, p. xx. "After the Attic writers, Greek underwent a *great change*." The change is COMPLETE in Polybius, with the latter historic writers, and Plutarch. "Ah, indeed. *And it is only in these very writers that BAPTIDZO ever means to immerse*. NO LEXICON IN THE WORLD HAS GIVEN ANY OTHER AUTHORITY TO SUPPORT IMMERSE THAN THESE WRITERS AND THOSE FOLLOWING STILL LATER. Well done for Liddell and Scott. But Liddell and Scott determined to wipe out *all* Dr. G. has said. They affix a catalogue of au-

thors, with the age in which each flourished, that we may "determine the *time* of a word's FIRST USAGE, and of its *subsequent changes of signification*." That again is exactly what I did, in all this debate. Now, then, Liddell and Scott tell us what *they* mean by "*first usage*"—the *earliest* usage. For earliest usage they "give the earliest authority." But Plutarch is the earliest they give for a literal meaning, or for dip, and they do not give immerse at all in any edition till the last year or so, when it had undergone half a dozen changes on *just this one word*—one change on *louo*, wash; pour. Plutarch "flourished about A. D. 110."

We would not quote so much here, but that it throws light on all our issues—changes of meanings, etc., especially the wonderful changes in classic Greek, that ushered in the very writers who first used *baptidzo* in the sense of immerse. We are completely sustained by Liddell and Scott in all points, and our opponent crushed.

Of late this Lexicon has been completely manipulated by immersionists as already shown. Yet it does not sustain them for the simple reason that their whole theory is so monstrous, unscientific and absurd, it *cannot be sustained*.

Let us now restate plainly the facts.

1. Liddell and Scott, 1. Define *baptidzo*, "To dip repeatedly; dip under." 2. They erase the second part, and later put it—"dip repeatedly." 3. They have "wet, pour upon." "They erase those definitions. There are *three* changes. 4. They proceed to erase "intoxicate," and put it "overwhelmed." Here are four changes. 5. They put it dip, spoken of ships, to sink them. This is five changes and a false rendering. Who ever saw a ship dip in the sense of going *entirely under* as you put men under water when you baptize them? Such a thing never occurred on earth. A ship dipping is *four-fifths* out, so far as she was above water. When a ship goes *entirely* under, it rises no more. 6. He next takes out "dip repeatedly," and patches it again, in his Sixth English edition. 7. He now puts in "immerse"—a word not in any early editions. Here then they have changed, re-changed, and changed again this Lexicon on *this one word*. They have done so on no

other. It is a good Lexicon—admirable. But who can attach any importance to what they say on this word after these facts? It is a good Lexicon, though, only because it is simply a condensed translation of Passow. It never would have been, as they stated, but for Passow

Gentlemen, of what value among thinkers is such a work? It only calls for contempt. It is only a good lexicon in other points, because Liddell & Scott did not make, but merely stole it. It claims to be an enlargement of Passow. It is only one-third the size of Passow, as you can see, this volume being one of three in Passow, and the one is far larger than Liddell & Scott. He professes to adopt the scientific course of Passow, “to make each article a history of the word.” Our analysis of his article on *baptidzo* shows how false it is. He does not quote an author for any of his literal meanings earlier than Plutarch, years after Christ, and yet gives Plato 429 B. C., for a metaphorical use. In a word, it never occurred to Liddell & Scott that there must be a literal earlier than a metaphorical meaning. Now, Doctor, I deliver the corpse over to you.

Tingo, Dr. Graves renders immerse. Now it was used by the fathers always as Pedobaptists use *baptidzo*, and Germans *taufen*, without implying mode specified. He ought to know this. Take a few examples. Tertullian, discussing whether the twelve apostles were baptized, refers to the opinion of many that when they were sprinkled (*adspergo*), by the violence of the waves, and Peter, when he “began to be immersed,” so the Greek New Testament reads, “was sufficiently mersed, (*satis mersum*),” but Tertullian thinks it is one thing to be sprinkled or mersed where it was not wanted, “another to be baptized (*tingo*) by the discipline of religion.” He often uses it thus for baptize. In *De Anima* he uses *tingo*, then gives *lavo*, *mergo*, *profundo* as details of the *tingo* baptize. I have already shown that moisten, wet, is its primary and general meaning, stain next.

We have shown that the fathers were with us, and need not quote again the same facts over. Indeed, nothing could speak the testimony of the fathers more accurately than the versions we gave you. No version for fifteen hundred years supports

the Doctor, not one. All support us overwhelmingly. As to metaphorical uses, are they not always based on real, actual, literal meanings? Does not Carson plainly tell him that? Will he deny it? But Origen did not use it metaphorically, nor David, Ezekiel, Christ, or Basil. They were all baptisms with literal water, all by affusion. There was not a metaphor anywhere in it. The land, couch, feet, altar, wood, all were physical objects, and water poured on, and rain poured down, and tears dropping down, baptizing, were all literal acts.

The Doctor has repeatedly made his flings at "controversialists." We regret this. It is in bad taste. He was a controversialist of the bitterest type ever known, perhaps, in our day, when I was a youth in college. If controversy be conducted with candor, investigation be full and impartial, controversy is the only way to elicit the whole truth. Clay, Webster and Calhoun, Jefferson, Madison and Hamilton, Bacon, Locke, Newton, Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo, Luther, Leibnitz, Calvin, Beza, Wesley, Bunyan and Arminius, not to say Paul and Christ, were controversialists, all, and almost constantly. It is little becoming the Doctor, we repeat, to make indelicate flings. They may be hurled back if persisted in.

We have never put the Syriac up to equality with the Greek text. Others have, who paid no attention to this question of baptism, but because of its untold advantages in settling the true import of the Greek. This all critics agree to, and that is just what we have done, used it to explain the Greek. For that use we have every scholar in the world, including all Baptists, with us.

As to the date of the Peshito, all of the best Oriental scholars put it in the apostolic age, and among the Baptists endorsing this are Gale, Judd and J. R. Graves, LL.D., as we read in a former speech. Origen, born only eighty-five years after John died, quotes the Peshito. It was in familiar use then. It is quoted or used by a Syrian, A. D. 220, as a familiar document. The whole Syrian church—Nestorian, his enemy the Monophysists, Melchite and Maronite, all sects agree that it is co-eval with the Syrian church, which we all know existed in Paul's day. Tremelius, Francius, Martini, Walton, Lowth,

Carpzoy, Leusden, Kennicott, S. Davidson, Palfrey, Stiles, all held it to have been in the language Christ spoke, and of the apostolic age. These testimonies weigh down the opinions of a hundred Arnolds. But why this cry now against a Version that immersionists all held in such estimation a few years ago? They then thought it supported them. Gotch led them into that error. Gotch, Conant, A. Campbell, Judd, all head their list of valuable and ancient versions with the Syriac.

Dr. Graves rightly told you the Syriac and Arabic "*amad*" were the same. But when Michaelis guesses without a word of support, and all the facts against him, and all philology, that it is the same as another word of another root, with different import, he is as wild as that "crazy" man who suggested that *baptidzo* was from *bathos*, a word as properly applying to altitudes, heights as depths; and so to baptize you would only have to elevate, lift up a man and he would be "bathosed" or baptized. "Crazy" yet!

At last the Doctor resolves to die in the last ditch. He says: "I take my position fair, square upon it. It is to dip, immerse." But Michaelis, in his own lexicon, gives it, "wash, baptize; (Aphel), immerse." By your law you must take the first meaning.

Catafago, who lived among the Arabs sixteen years as a scholar, in his lexicon gives it only the meaning, "to be wet with rain."

Castell, equivalent to twenty-one lexicons on this, based on two native Syrian lexicons when it was a living language, ninth and tenth centuries, supports this, and gives us sprinkle, bedew, sprinkle with rain, dew, etc.

Gutbier gives to dip, no immerse, only baptize and "sustentavit," that all know is an error, and opposed to dip or immerse.

Let the Baptist Gotch show just one place where immerse, Greek *kataduno*, or *katapontizo* etc., or *dupto*, are translated *amad*. We have given undeniable instances where the Greek *louo*, wash, pour, sprinkle, is translated *amad*, and here they are before you. Facts settle the matter, and show what authority is correct.

Gesenius and Schindler, thought *amad* was the same as the Hebrew, simply because spelled alike, but all scholars know that often two Hebrew words are spelled exactly alike, as are English words, yet radically different in meaning and use. They have it "stand," because they "stood who were baptized."

Gesenius has it: "*Amad* is to baptize, because he stood in the water to be baptized." "*Quia baptizandus stabat in aquam.*" This answers. This is runious to dip, etc., but is a false philology, as Dr. Graves will agree.

The reason assigned why the Version was made in the interior is not sufficient. The Syriac of Galilee was a crude dialect, that of Jerusalem mixed, and that will account for Matthew's gospel not surviving in the old Syriac dialect in which it was composed. In Jerusalem they had the gospel in the Syriac, if not several other parts of the New Testament, before the Greek ones were made. All history and all the facts support this, as S. Davidson shows in his Introduction, vol. i. The carrying the gospel to all nations required it in Greek, as that tongue was familiar with multitudes in Egypt, Asia Minor, Rome, Palestine, and all Greece.

But the pure dialect of Syria was the one a version would survive in, and there it was made, where Paul and John had preached so often, as well as Thaddeus. All Syria held that Thaddeus made the version of the New Testament, (*Bibliotheca Orient.* tom. iii. p. 212). There is no shadow of proof to the contrary.

Once more the Doctor tries his hand on Leigh—quoting from second hand no doubt, hence mislead. He quotes Leigh as saying of *baptidzo*: "Its native, proper signification is to plunge into water." Leigh says nothing of the kind, but just the reverse, as already produced. That is an out an out immersionist who wrote immediately after the revival of learning, when immersion was law, gospel, salvation and all, to the parties so holding, and quoted by Leigh on their side, as he gives both sides. But his own position was given; it primarily meant any kind of washing, even that "where there was no immersion present," as well as *adspergere*, to sprinkle.

It was on *louo* Liddell and Scott still retain *pour* in the English work, a copy of which I examined. It is rightly quoted that way in your Ingham, p. 455, in your hand, as I see you have it.

Now, then, with these additional facts before us, how stands the case? What has he done but quibble, misunderstand us, miss the quotations, dart here and there, but all to no purpose. We have pursued him into every retreat, routed him from every position, until like the deer pressed to its last refuge, it faints and falls by the way.

What has he done with our Laver argument? Nothing at all. Mainly he never noticed it at all—only to question whether he had included so and so in the quotation I made from him, asserting that Hebrews ix. 10 referred to the washings under the law. For fifteen hundred years all baptisms were by affusion. Every Jew daily thus baptized. It was *with* water. They anointed *with (en) oil*—washed (*hudati*) *with* water, and they *baptized with* water. They were baptized *with the Spirit*—it was poured on them as the pitchers of water were poured on the altar in Elijah's day; they pour on the water says the Bible, poured it on the *altar* and the *wood*. Greek writers say *baptized* the altar—baptized the wood.

Such are the facts, and they will stand forever. The Buxtorff you quote is not the great author I quoted, but his son—wrong again. The old and great lexicographer never wrote a Syriac lexicon.—[*Time out.*

DR. GRAVES' SEVENTEENTH SPEECH.

Replication.

MR. PRESIDENT:—There are several matters in my opponent's former speeches I wish to notice before submitting them to the verdict of public opinion.

And first, I will assure him that no amount of threatening can, for one moment, deter me from exposing the use he has made of Schleusner and Stokius in order to convince the world that Baptists are unbaptized. His book, containing his statements, has gone forth to the world, and his speeches are to be given to the printed page to go forth, and these statements he is wont, in his public lectures, to make all over the Southwest; and it is time they should be corrected.

He urges, in justification of his suppressing a part of what Schleusner says of *baptidzo*, that I, nor Alex. Campbell, nor Ingham, have given all the definitions. If Mr. Campbell, or Ingham, or myself, have done a great wrong it in no way excuses Eld. Ditzler. But have we, in any sense, misrepresented Schleusner? We only professed to give what he declares to be the primary and *proper* definition of *baptidzo*, seeking, as we are, for its use in this sense in the New Testament, not what he claimed to be the secondary and figurative use of the word, for on these he discourses through a page and a half of his lexicon, nothing of which has any weight in determining its literal and proper meaning. This is the reason why I have only given, as a rule, the primary signification of Passow, and all other lexicons, and for this reason A. Campbell, and Ingham, and writers generally, quote the primary definitions only; and in doing so the lexicons are not misrepresented.

But Eld. Ditzler, in this instance, has palpably suppressed an explanation of Schleusner, a part of a sentence, so that he makes him testify to a manifest untruth, and to what Schleus-

ner does not say when his whole sentence is correctly translated. The suppression is openly confessed, and it is one that no scholar or controversialist can be excused for perpetrating. Take it as he gives it, and as it stands in his book.

"*Baptidzo*. *Proprie*: immergo ac intingo, in aquam mergo, *bapto* * * In hac autem significatione nunquam in Novo Testamento, sed ea frequentius in Script. Gr. legitur, v. c., Diod. Sic., i. ch. 36, de Nilo exundante." etc.

"Properly, to immerse or dip, to plunge into water, from *bapto*. * * But in this sense it never occurs in the New Testament, but it does occur very frequently in the Greek [classic] writers, for example, in Diodorus Siculus, upon the overflowing of the Nile," etc.

If this is a full and fair statement of what Schleusner says, then he does say that *baptidzo* is never used in its proper, literal signification—i. e., "to immerse," "to dip," "to plunge into water," in the New Testament, which is contrary to what he says elsewhere under *baptisma*, and contrary to the testimony of all standard critics and lexicographers. To make Schleusner say this is to put a falsehood into his mouth. But does he say it? is the question. I affirm that he does not; the very text manifestly shows he does not. I give it once more, letter and point, as it stands in the lexicon.

"*Baptidzo*. 1. *Proprie*: immergo ac intingo, in aquam mergo, a *bapto*, et respondet Hebraico *taval*, 2 Reg. v. 14, in vers. Alex. et *tava*, apud Symmachum Psalm lxviii. 5, et apud *incertum*, Ps. ix. 6. In hac significatione nunquam in N. T., sed ea frequentius in Script. Gr. legitur, v. c., Diod. Sic., i. ch. 36, de Nilo exundante: '*toon chersaioon therioon tapolla hupo ton potomou perilephthenta diaphtheiretai baptizomena*.' Multa terrestrium animalium, a flumine deprehensorum, submersione periunt."

Which I translate :

—"Properly, to *plunge into and dip in, to sink into water*, from *bapto*, and corresponds to the Hebrew *taval*, 2 Kings v. 14, in the Alexandrian version, and [corresponds] to *tava* in Symmachus Psalm lxviii. 5, and in an unknown writer in Psalm ix. 6. In this signification it is never used in the New Testament, but frequently in Greek writers, for example, v. c., Diod. Sic., i. c. 36, concerning the overflow of the Nile. [Omitting the Greek and adopting Schleusner's translation of it.] Many land animals, overtaken by the river, perished by the submersion."

Now, the whole matter in dispute, turns on what "*hac*" refers to in fifth line. Does it refer to the last mentioned meaning of *tava*, as given in the two last psalms quoted, or to the signification distinguished by the term "*proprie*," and

answering to the Hebrew word *taval*? Undoubtedly to the last, *tava*, which is used in the two Psalms referred to, in the sense of to destroy by the overflowing; and Schleusner declares that in this sense—i. e., “to drown, to perish by the submersion,” it is never used in the New Testament, but often in classic writers. I submit my translation and construction with confidence to the verdict of every scholar on the continent. I do not think Dr. Varden,* nor Dr. Talbert, nor Dr. Breaker, nor any other member of my committee of referees, will hesitate to endorse them as correct. Not to influence the verdict of scholars, but for this occasion, I made my translation and criticism and submitted them to Jas. P. Boyce, President of the Southern Theological Seminary, one of the ripest scholars of this age, for his opinion, which I only received last night. He says:

“Upon the passage you are undoubtedly correct. The *hac* cannot refer to the first, but to the last, and only to the second as it may be regarded as identical with the last. I think it has reference to the last only.”

I now submit this as a case made out, and as one of the most flagrant suppressions of the words of an author, making him to say the very opposite of what he does say, that I have ever met with. His attempt to turn it off with a sneer or a laugh will not avail him. His false coin, that he has been so long passing off on the ignorant and credulous, is at last nailed to the counter.

I refer all back to my former speech, that they may see Schleusner's definitions of the noun *baptisma*, which Eld. Ditzler entirely fails to give, because, had he given it, every one could see for himself how foully the author had been dealt with. Instead of saying that, in the New Testament, baptism is never used in the sense of “to immerse,” he says:

“*Baptisma* is a verbal noun from the perfect passive of the verb *baptidzo*. (1) Properly, immersion, a dipping into water, a bathing. Hence it is transferred (2) to the sacred rite which preeminently is called baptism. and IN WHICH FORMERLY THEY WERE IMMersed IN WATER, that they might be obligated to the true divine religion.”

You see, that when referring to the physical act of baptism,

* Dr. Varden was chairmn of the speaker's committee of referees, viz., Dr. J. M. D. Breaker, and Dr. H. Talbert.

Schleusner says it means nothing else than immersion or a dipping into water, and that this is its sacred or New Testament use.

Stokius' Lexicon.

The impression he has sought to make with this lexicon is not justified in the least by the language of its author. If I have been correctly impressed, it is that this distinguished scholar teaches that *baptidzo* means "to wash, to apply water in any way, to sprinkle," etc. Let me place Stokius and A. Campbell in their true light before my hearers and the world.

Stokius gives, first the general and then the special, signification of words, then the *tropical* or *figurative* uses at length. With the figurative uses of *baptidzo* we have nothing to do in determining the action, therefore we do the lexicographer no injustice when we give only his meanings of a word when used in its physical sense. Therefore Mr. Campbell, nor myself, nor any other man, is chargeable with fault because we give only the literal, primary definitions of Stokius, and in no sense change his meaning.

What does he say about *adspergendo*? He simply gives it as his opinion that the washing or cleansing, which he says is figuratively called baptism in two places in the New Testament to which he refers (Mark vii. 4, Luke xi. 38, where the Pharisees, returning from market, are said not to eat unless they had baptized themselves), might be and was accustomed to be performed by sprinkling water. This is an opinion only, which is opposed by Dr. Alting, Dr. Kitto, Dr. Meyer, Maimonides, and all Jewish commentators, who, it must be allowed, understood their own customs. But grant that the washing before eating, in this instance, was performed by sprinkling, does it help Eld. Ditzler's case? Not the least, for Stokius says it is only called a baptism by a figure of speech, as we are accustomed to say the land was baptized in blood and tears, or immersed in calamities, overwhelmed by taxation, etc.; we have only the *effect* in our mind, and have no reference to the act that produced it.

But this figure is not found in the inspired text, it is only

the creation of the English translators. The Holy Spirit says that when they came from market, the Pharisees did not eat without first washing themselves—taking a bath, says the Syriac. Our translators unfortunately translated *baptidzo* here figuratively by “wash,” instead of literally and properly, “immerse,” hence, all this confusion of ideas gotten up about it. Stokius then tells us that by another *figure* called *synecdoche*, where a *part* is put for the *whole*, it is used to denote the whole ministry of John, as in Acts xix. 3. Will Eld. Ditzler claim that the ministry of John is one of the proper meanings of *baptidzo*? It is certainly just as much so as “to wash,” “to cleanse,” “to wet,” “to moisten,” are. The former is so used by *synecdoche*, and the latter only by *metonymy*.

Then Stokius says, thirdly, that by *metonymy* *baptidzo* denotes the miraculous outpouring of the Holy Spirit at pentecost, as well on account of the abundance of the gifts of the Spirit, as that formerly water was poured copiously upon those baptized, or they were briefly immersed in water. In this sentence I confess that Stokius speaks more like a churchman than a scholar—his own baptism is at stake. But he says that the outpouring of the Holy Spirit was called a baptism, not because it was so in fact, or in its action, but in its effect, and therefore figuratively called so because of its abundance—it brought them all wholly within its influence—there was an immersion in effect. They were as thoroughly under its influence as though immersed in it.

Now these are all the meanings he gives of *baptidzo*, when used *literally*, anywhere. In this Mr. Campbell did not misrepresent him, and in quoting his testimony as to the proper meaning of *baptidzo*, only these need be given. To make this author favor sprinkling as the only New Testament mode, Elder Ditzler would fain make Stokius say, as he does Schleusner, that in its proper, literal sense of “to immerse” and “dip” it is not used in the New Testament. Does Stokius say this? If under his definition of *baptidzo* he leaves any doubt, we should look, Blackstone tells us, elsewhere for something written by the same author on the same subject, etc.

Let us examine his definition of *baptidzo*, the only noun in the New Testament used to designate baptism:

"BAPTISMA. 1.) Generatim et vi originis notat *immersiōnem* vel *intinctionem*. 2.) Speciatim, a) *proprie* notat *immersiōnem*, vel *intinctionem* *rei in aquam*, ut abluatur, vel lavetur. Hinc transfertur ad designandum *primum* Novi Testamenti *sacramentum* quod *initiationis* vocant, nempe *baptismum*, quo baptizandi olim in aquam immergebeantur, utut hodiernum aqua iis saltem adspargatur, ut a peccati sordibus abluantur, illius remissionem consequantur, et in fœdere gratiæ recipiantur, tanquam hæredes vitæ æternæ."

Which I translate:

"BAPTISMA. 1. Generally, and by force of the original, it denotes immersion or dipping. 2. Specially *a*. Properly, it denotes the immersion or dipping of a thing in water that it may be cleansed or washed. Hence, it is transferred to designate the first sacrament of the New Testament, which they call of initiation, namely baptism, in which those to be baptized were formerly immersed into water; though at this time the water is only sprinkled upon them, that they may be cleansed from the pollutions of sin, receive the remission of it, and be received into the covenant of grace, as heirs of eternal life."

This testimony of Stokius, which sets him in a clear light before the most common mind, Elder Ditzler entirely suppresses, and substitutes for it a few definitions of *baptismos*, a noun never used to denote the baptismal rite, as "washing, cleansing, baptism." Is this treating a witness fairly—not to permit him to speak the whole truth and to distort what he does say?

But is it supposable that Stokius says anything, when he defines *baptidzo*, that contradicts this? By no means.

He says that *tropically*, which he explains to mean by a figure of speech called *metonymy*, where one thing as the *effect* of an action is spoken of in place of the action or cause that produced it—by this figure, and only by this figure, is *baptidzo* ever used in the sense of "to cleanse," "to wash," and the fact that we are accustomed to dip anything in order to wash or cleanse it, suggested the figure—but what intelligent person would say that "to wash" or "to cleanse," are proper, and real definitions of *baptidzo*?

But does Stokius intimate that Christian baptism was administered by Christ or his apostles by sprinkling? If he

did, it would amount to an *opinion* only; but giving the proper meaning of words is a matter of *fact*.

Against his statement under *baptidzo*, that the subjects were formerly copiously poured upon, as well as immersed in water, we must place his positive statement under *baptisma*, (which he says is a word transferred to designate the sacred rite), "in which formerly those baptized were immersed in water although to-day water is merely sprinkled upon them," etc.

I have thus placed the testimony of Stokius, as that of Schleusner, fully before you. We can all see what he *does* and what he does not say.

He does not say that the proper and literal meaning of *baptidzo* in the New Testament is "to wash," or "to cleanse," but "to immerse," "to dip into water," and that it can only be used to denote "to wash," or "to cleanse" by a *figure of speech*. He thinks that the Pharisees cleansed themselves when they came from market by sprinkling, and, therefore, that washing may sometimes be effected by sprinkling. What shadow of support does all this give to prove that sprinkling was enjoined by Christ for Christian baptism? Not so much as a figurative support.

In view of the use Eld. Ditzler has made of Stokius and Schleusner, it must be that his translations and use of authorities will be very carefully examined before they are received, and his violent charges of unfaithfulness, quibbling and suppression in others will return upon his own head. I will now advance my argument direct.

Argument—Proof from the Universal Testimony of Pedobaptist Historians of all Denominations.

I introduce my argument, which will be but the testimony of historians, Protestants and Catholics, with the following Historical Examination, which occurred this year, and the vindication of the professor of history. I clip it from a Congregational paper, *The Mirror*, Maine :

"ARE THE BAPTISTS HISTORICALLY RIGHT?—At the anniversary of our Theological Seminary at Bangor, a few days since, the class under

examination in Church History gave some answers which struck me as extremely remarkable. The questions of the professor, and replies of the students, were substantially as follows :

"Q.—What was the apostolic and primitive mode of baptism ?

"A.—By immersion.

"Q.—Under what circumstances only was sprinkling allowed ?

"A.—In case of sickness.

"Q.—When was the practice of sprinkling and pouring generally introduced ?

"A.—Not until the fourteenth century.

"Q.—For what reason was the change adopted.

"A.—As Christianity advanced and spread in colder latitudes, the severity of the weather made it impracticable to immerse.

"The Professor of Church History approved the answers, which faithfully represented his teachings, and none of the clergymen present seemed to call the statements in question. Yet if such are the facts, the Baptists are historically correct, and we as a denomination are wrong, both in our literature and practice."

Are these answers correct? Prof. L. L. Paine, D. D., who occupies the chair of Ecclesiastical History, in Bangor Theological Seminary, Congregationalist, thus answers for himself :

"It may be honestly asked by some, Was immersion the primitive form of baptism ; and if so, what then ? As to the question of fact, the testimony is ample and decisive. No matter of church history is clearer. The evidence is all one way, and all church historians of any repute agree in accepting it. We cannot claim even originality in teaching it in a Congregational Seminary. And we really feel guilty of a kind of anachronism in writing an article to insist upon it. It is a point on which ancient, mediæval and modern historians alike, Catholic and Protestant, Lutheran and Calvinist, have no controversy. And the simple reason for this unanimity is that the statements of the early Fathers are so clear, and the light shed upon these statements from the early customs of the church is so conclusive, that no historian who cares for his reputation would dare to deny it, and no historian who is worthy of the name would wish to. There are some historical questions concerning the early church on which the most learned writers disagree—for example, the question of infant baptism ; but on this one, of the early practice of immersion, the most distinguished antiquarians, such as Bingham, Augusti (Coleman), Smith (Dictionary of the Bible), and historians, such as Mosheim, Gieseler, Hase, Neander, Milman, Schaff, Alzog (Catholic), hold a common language. The following extract from Coleman's Antiquities very accurately expresses what all agree to :

'In the primitive church, immersion was undeniably the common mode of baptism. The utmost that can be said of *sprinkling* in that early period is that it was, in case of necessity, permitted as an exception to a general rule. This fact is so well established that it were needless to adduce

"As one further illustration we quote from Schaff's *Apostolic Church* :

'As to the outward *mode* of administering this ordinance, immersion, and not sprinkling, was unquestionably the original, normal form.'

"But while immersion was the universal custom, an abridgment of the rite was freely allowed and defended in cases of urgent necessity, such as sickness and approaching death, and the peculiar form of sprinkling thus came to be known as "clinical" baptism, or the baptism of the sick. It is somewhat significant that no controversy of any account ever rose in the Church on this question of the form of baptism, down to the Reformation. And hence it is difficult to determine with complete accuracy just when immersion gave way to sprinkling as the common church practice. The two forms were employed, one as the rule, the other as the exception, until, as Christianity traveled northward into a colder climate, the exception silently grew to be the rule.

"As late as the thirteenth century, immersion still held its ground, as is shown in a passage in the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas Aquinas, where the arguments in favor of the two modes of baptism are compared, and the conclusion is drawn that immersion is the *safer* because the more *common* form, (*quia hoc habet communiorem usum*). Three centuries later, in the time of the Reformers, sprinkling had become common, and even quite universal; though Calvin speaks of the different forms of baptism in a way which seems to imply that immersion was by no means obsolete. So that Dr. Schaff puts the date quite early enough, we think, when he says that 'not until the end of the thirteenth century did sprinkling become the rule and immersion the exception.' It is to be remarked, also, that this change occurred only in the Western or Latin Church. In the Greek Church, immersion has remained the rule to the present day."

I propose to commence with the historians of the oldest church and come down.

My argument is, That act that was practiced by John the Baptist, by the apostles, and by all the apostolic churches, and which has been perpetuated until this day, must truly represent the signification which Christ intended, and the apostles understood by *baptidzo*.

Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Writers, A. D. 33-100,

John, A. D. 30. "I indeed immerse you in water." Matt. iii. 10.

Paul, A. D. 35 to 60. "Therefore we were buried with him by immersion unto death." Epistle to Rom. iii. 10.

"Buried with him in baptism." Epis. to Col. ii.

Barnabas, A. D. 50 to 100, supposed to have been the companion of St. Paul. in an epistle ascribed to him, and which

must have been *very early* written, whoever may have been the author, speaks of baptism as a going, "down into the water." "We go down into the water, full of sin and filth, but we come up bearing Christ in our hearts," is his language.

Hermas, writing about A. D. 95, in the "Shepherd," a work ascribed to him, speaks of the apostles as having gone "down into the water," with those they baptized, "and come up again."

Justin Martyr, writing about A. D. 140, speaks of those baptized, as "washed in the water," in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

Tertullian, writing about A. D. 204, says, the person to be baptized, "is led down into the water, and with a few words said, is *dipped*."

Hippolytus, about A. D. 225, says: "For he who goes down with faith into the bath of regeneration, is arrayed against the evil one, and on the side of Christ. He comes up from the baptism bright as the sun, flashing forth the rays of righteousness."

The Eastern or Greek Church Historians, A. D. 300.

GREGORY, A. D. 360, says: "We are buried with Christ by baptism, that we may also rise with him."*

BASIL, A. D. 360, says: "By three *immersions* the great mystery of baptism is accomplished;" † referring to true baptism.

AMBROSE, A. D. 374, says: "Thou saidst I do believe, and wast *immersed* in water—that is, thou wast buried."‡

CYRIL, A. D. 374, says: "Candidates are first anointed with consecrated oils; they are then conducted to the laver, and asked three times if they believed in the Father, Son and Holy Ghost; then they are *dipped* three times into the water, and retire by three distinct efforts."§

CHRYSOSTOM, A. D. 398, says: "To be baptized and *plunged* in the water, and then to emerge, or rise again, is a symbol of our descent into the grave, and our ascent out of it."||

* Stennett's Reply, p. 144.

† Baronius, Ann. v. Bing. Antiq. b. xi, ch. xi.

‡ Stennett's Reply, p. 144; Bing. Antiq., b. ii, ch. ii.

§ Dupin's Eccl. Hist., ch. vi, v, 2—Orchard's Hist. Bap., p. 43, Nash. ed. 1855.

|| Com. on 1 Cor., Hom. 40, 1.—Bingham's Christ. Antiq.

STOURDZA says: "The church of the West has, then, departed from the example of Jesus Christ; she has obliterated the whole sublimity of the exterior sign. *Baptism* and *immersion* are identical. Baptism by *aspersion* is, as if one should say, *immersion* by *aspersion*; or any other absurdity of the same nature."

DR. WHITBY.—The observation of the Greek church is this, that He *who ascended out of the water*, must first *descend down into it*."

DR. WALL.—"The Greek church in all the branches of it does still use immersion." "All the Christians in Asia, all in Africa, and about one-third part of Europe, are of the last sort, in which third part of Europe are comprehended the Christians of Græcia, Thracia, Servia, Bulgaria, Rascia, Wallachia, Moldavia, Russia, Nigra, and so on; and even the Muscovites, who, if the coldness of the country will excuse, might plead for a dispensation with the most reason of any."—Hist. of Inf. Bap., part ii, ch. ix.

DEYLINGIUS.—"The Greeks retain the rite of immersion to this day, as Jeremiah, the Patriarch of Constantinople, declares."—De Prudent. Pastoral, part iii, ch. iii, 26.

BUDDEUS.—"That the Greeks defend immersion is manifest, and has been frequently observed by learned men, which Ludolphus informs us is the practice of the Ethiopians."—Theol. Dogmat., b. v, c. i, § 5.

SCHUBERT.—"It is the opinion of the Greeks that the true baptism of Christ is administered, not by the application of water in any way, but by immersion, or by hiding the person to be baptized under water."—Instit. Theol. Polem., pars ii, c. iii, 12.

RUSSIAN CATECHISM.—"This they [the Greek church in Russia] hold to be a point *necessary*, that no part of the child be undipped in the water."—In Booth on Bap., vol. ii, p. 414.

The Bishop of the Cyclades, in 1837, published at Athens a book entitled "The Orthodox Doctrine." Speaking of sprinkling he says:

"Where has the Pope taken the practice from? Where has the Western church seen it adopted, that she declares it to be right? Has she learned it from the baptism of the Lord? Let Jordan bear witness, and first proclaim the immersions and the emersions. From the words of our Lord? Hear them aright. Disciple the nations, then baptize them. He says not, then anoint them, sprinkle them; but he plainly commissions his apostles to baptize. The word *baptidzo* explained, means a veritable *dipping*, and in fact a *perfect dipping*. An object is baptized when it is completely concealed. This is the proper explanation of the word *baptidzo*. Did the Pope, then, learn it from the apostles, or from the word and the expression, or from the church in the splendor of her an-

tiquity? Nowhere did such a practice prevail; nowhere can a Scriptural passage be found to afford shelter to the opinions of the Western church."—In Bap. Mag., 1849.

PROF. STUART.—"The mode of baptism by immersion, the Oriental church has ALWAYS CONTINUED TO PRESERVE, EVEN DOWN TO THE PRESENT TIME."

The Eastern or Latin Catholic Church Historians, A. D. 611.

I now call to the stand seven unimpeachable witnesses—Catholics, and standard historians of their church:

Bishop Bossuet says:

"We are able to make it appear, by the acts of councils and by ancient rituals, that for *thirteen hundred years* baptism was thus administered (by immersion) throughout the whole church, as far as possible." *

Dr. Brenner says:

"*Thirteen hundred years* was baptism generally and originally performed by the *immersion* of the person under water; and only in extraordinary cases was sprinkling, or affusion, permitted. These latter methods of baptism were called in question and even prohibited." †

The venerable Bede, born A. D. 672, and died A. D. 735, and a church historian, says:

"He who is baptized is seen to descend into the font; he is seen to ascend out of the water."

J. Maldonatus, taught in Paris and Rome, author of commentaries, died in 1583, and says:

"For, in Greek, to be baptized is the same as to be submerged."—Com. on Matt. xx, 22, Luke xii, 50.

F. E. De Meyeray (1610–1683), a French historian of great note, and royal historiographer of France, says:

"In baptism in the twelfth century they plunged the candidate in the sacred font to show them what operation that sacrament hath on the soul."

Speaking of the eighth and thirteenth centuries, he says:

"Baptism remained in the Catholic church the same, and was performed by dipping or plunging, not by pouring or sprinkling."—Meyeray's Hist. of France.

* Stennett ad Russen, p. 176.—Booth's Pedo. Ex. ch. 4.

† Hist. Exhib. Bap., p. 806.

Breuard Picart (1663–1733), In “The Religious Ceremonies of all Nations,” says:

“Baptism by ablution, or aspersion, was not known in the first century of the church, when immersion was only used; and it is said it continued so till St. Gregory’s time.”—Relig. Ceremo., vol. ii, p. 82.

A. Bower (1686–1766), author of the “History of the Popes,” says:

“Baptism by immersion was undoubtedly the Apostolical practice, and was never dispensed with by the church except in cases of sickness,” etc.—Hist. of the Popes, vol. iii, p. 110.

The Anglican or Episcopal Church Historians, A. D. 1534.

No names stand higher in the Church of England than these, no authority more unquestionable.

Dr. Whitby says: “And this *immersion* being religiously observed by *all Christians for thirteen centuries*, and approved by our church, &c.,” referring to the church of England.

Bingham, in his Christian Antiquities, says: “The ancients thought that *immersion*, or burying under water, did more lively represent the death, burial and resurrection of Christ, as well as our own death to sin, and arising again into righteousness.”

In his Origines, says: “As this (dipping) was the original apostolical practice, so it continued the *universal* practice of the church for many ages.”

Dr. Wm. Cave (1637–1713), a learned divine, Church Historian, and chaplain to Charles II., says: “The party to be baptized was wholly immersed or put under water, whereby they did more notably and significantly express the three great ends and effects of baptism.”—Prim. Christ. p. 1, ch. x.

Again: “As in immersion there are, in a manner, three several acts, the putting the person into water, his abiding there for a little time, and his rising up again, so by these were represented Christ’s death, burial and resurrection, and in conformity thereunto our dying unto sin, the destruction of its power, and our resurrection to a new course of life.”

Dr. George Gregory (1754–1808), educated at Edinburg,

preached in Liverpool and London, a miscellaneous and historic writer, says :

"The initiatory rite of baptism was (in the first century) publicly performed by immersing the whole body," etc.—*Hist. of the Ch.*, vol. i., p. 53.

Dr. A. P. Stanley, born 1815, an eminent English scholar, divine and historian, professor of church history at Oxford, Dean of Westminster, chaplain to the Prince of Wales, and also in ordinary to Queen Victoria, says ;

"There can be no question that the original form of baptism was complete immersion in the deep baptismal waters, and for at least four centuries any other form was either unknown or disregarded, unless in case of dangerous illness as an exceptional, almost a monstrous case. To this form the Eastern church still rigidly adheres, and the Byzantine Empire absolutely repudiates and ignores any other mode of administration as essentially invalid."—*Eastern Church*, p. 117.

Again :

"He came 'baptizing'—that is, signifying to those who come to him, as he plunged them under the rapid torrent, the forgiveness and forsaking of their former sins. It was in itself no new ceremony. Ablutions, in the East, have always been more or less a part of religious worship—easily performed, and always welcome. Every synagogue, if possible, was by the side of a stream or spring; every mosque still requires a fountain or basin for lustrations in its court."

Dr. Wm. Wall, M. A., (1645–1727,) vicar of Shoreham, Kent, a writer of note, who published a *History of Infant Baptism* of 852, pages explored all the voluminous writings of antiquity in search of evidence to support infant baptism, says :

"This (immersion) is so plain and clear by an infinite number of passages, that one cannot but pity the weak endeavors of such Pedobaptists as would maintain the negative of it; so we ought to disown and show a dislike of the profane scoffs which some people give to the English Antipedobaptists merely for the use of dipping, when it was, in all probability, the way by which our blessed Saviour, and for certain, was the most usual and ordinary way by which the ancient Christians did receive their baptism. 'Tis a great want of prudence, as well as of honesty, to refuse to grant to an adversary what is certainly true, and may be proved so. It creates a jealousy of all the rest that one says.

"The custom of the Christians is the near succeeding times (to the apostles), being more largely and particularly delivered in books, is known to have been generally or ordinarily a total immersion."—*Hist. of Inf. Bap.*, Pt. ii., ch. ix., § 2, and its Defence, p. 131.

"What has been said of this custom of pouring or sprinkling water in the ordinary use of baptism, is to be understood only in reference to *those western parts* of Europe, for it is used ordinarily nowhere else. The Greek church does still use immersion, and so do all other Christians in the world except the Latins. All those nations of Christians that do now or formerly did, submit to the authority of the Bishop of Rome do ordinarily baptize their infants by pouring or sprinkling; but all other Christians in the world, who never owned the Pope's usurped power, *do, and ever did, dip their infants* in the ordinary use. All the Christians in Asia, all in Africa, and about one third part of Europe are of the last sort."—His. Inf. Bap., Pt. ii., ch. ix., p. 376, ed. 3.

Referring to the well known and disputed passage in Irenæus, he says :

"Since this is the first mention that we have met with of infants baptized, it is worth the while to look back and consider how near this man was to the apostles' time. Here is the passage, which was written about the year 167 : 'For he [Christ] came to save all persons by himself, all, I mean, who by him are regenerated unto God, infants, and little ones, and children, and youths, and elder persons. Therefore he went through every age; for infants, being made an infant, sanctifying infants,' etc."

The learned Winer says : "Irenæus does not mention it [infant baptism] as has been supposed."

"There is no earlier record, that Mr. Wall could discover, than in the case of Novatian, about the middle of the third century. This man while unbaptized, as Eusebius records (Eccles. Hist. L. VI., ch. xliii.), 'fell into a dangerous disease, and because he was very like to die, was baptized in the bed where he lay (*en klinu perichuthenta*—i. e., *sprinkled over in bed*, or water *poured all over him*, the word signifies) if that might be termed baptism.' Novatian recovered; and by the following circumstance we have remarkably preserved the view which the Christian church generally took of his baptism : The See of Rome became vacant, A. D. 251. Two persons were chosen to succeed, namely, Cornelius, "chosen by the major part," and this Novatian, in a "schismatical way." Cornelius writes a long letter to Fabius, Bishop of Antioch, in which he describes the case of Novatian, and says (as Mr. Wall translates it), "that Novatian came not canonically to his order of priesthood, much less was he capable of being chosen Bishop." Let the reader mark the reason assigned, "For that ALL THE CLERGY, and a GREAT MANY of the laity, were against his being chosen presbyter; because it was not lawful (they said) for any one that had been baptized in his bed [Greek, as above, *poured over*], as he had been, to be admitted to any office of the clergy."'" Wall's Hist. Part ii. ch. ix 2." Pengilly's Script. Guide to Baptism, p. 77.

Now, notice, with the testimony of the learned Winer and his translation of the record, do I offset and expose the perversion of this transaction by my opponent.

"France seems to have been the first country in the world where baptism by affusion was used ordinarily to persons in health and in the public way of administering it. There had been some synods in some dioceses that had spoken of affusion without mentioning immersion at all, but for an office or liturgy of any church this is, I believe, the first in the world that prescribes aspersion absolutely. As for sprinkling, properly called, it seems it was at 1645 just then beginning and used by very few. It must have begun in the disorderly times after 1641, for M. Blake, who lived in England in 1644, had never used it nor seen it used.—Hist. Inf. Bap., Part ii., ch. ix.

Speaking of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, from 1558 to 1603, he says :

"It being allowed to weak children (though strong enough to be brought to Christ) to be baptized by affusion, many ladies and gentlemen first, and then by degrees the common people, would obtain the favor of the priest to have their children pass for weak children, too tender to endure dipping in water; especially (as Mr. Walker observes) if some instance really were, or were but fancied or framed, of some child taking hurt by it. And another thing that had a greater influence than this was, that many of our English divines and other people had, during Queen Mary's bloody reign (from 1553 to 1558), fled to Germany, Switzerland, etc., and, coming back in Queen Elizabeth's time, they brought with them a great love to the customs of those Protestant churches wherein they had sojourned; and especially the authority of Calvin and the rules he had established at Geneva, had a mighty influence on a great number of our people about that time. Now, Calvin had not only given his dictate, in his Institutes, that the difference is of no moment whether he that is baptized be dipped all over, and if so, whether thrice or once, or whether he be only WETTED with the water poured on him, but he had also drawn up for the use of his church at Geneva, (and afterward published to the world) a form of administering the sacraments where, when he comes to order the act of baptizing, he words it thus: 'Then the minister of baptism pours water on the infant, saying, I baptize thee, etc. There had been, as I said, some synods in some dioceses of France that had spoken of affusion without mentioning immersion at all, that being the common practice, but for an office of liturgy of any church, this is, I believe, the first in the world that prescribes affusion absolutely.'—Hist. Inf. Bap.

Again :

"So (parallel to the rest of their reformations) they (the reformers) reformed the font into a basin. This General Assembly (Westminster) (met 1643) could not remember that fonts to be baptized in, had been always used by the primitive Christians long before the beginning of Popery, and ever since churches were built; but that sprinkling, for the common use of baptizing, was really introduced (in France first, and then in the Popish countries) in times of Popery; and that accordingly all those countries in which the usurped power of the Pope is, or has formerly been

owned, have left off dipping of children in the font, but that all other countries in the world (which had never regarded his authority) do still use it; and that basins, except in case of necessity, were never used by Papists or any other Christians whatsoever, till by themselves. So, parallel to the rest of their reformation, they reformed the font into a basin."—Hist. Inf. Bap., vol. ii., p. 368.

"It is no small evidence that infant baptism was not usually practiced in the Greek church during many centuries, because Constantine the Great, the son of Helene, who was a zealous Christian, was not baptized till he was advanced in years."—Hist. Inf. Bap., Part ii., p. 42, sec. 16.

Once more :

"In England there seems to have been some priest so early as the year 816 that attempted to bring in the use of baptism by affusion in the public administration, for Spelman recites a canon of a council in that year: 'Let the priests know, that when they administer holy baptism, they must not pour the water on the head of the infant, but they must always be dipped in the font.'—Hist. Inf. Bap., vol. i., p. 714.

Dr. G. Waddington, a man of learning, and author of works on Church History and the Reformation (1835), says :

"The ceremony of immersion, the oldest form of baptism, was performed in the name of the three persons of the Trinity."—Ch. Hist., ch. ii., sec. 3.

Bishop B. B. Smith, Bishop of the Episcopal church of Kentucky, says :

"We have only to go back six or eight hundred years, and immersion was the only mode, except in the case of the few baptized on their beds at the real, or supposed approach of death. Immersion was not only universal six or eight hundred years ago, but it was primitive and apostolic. The bowl and sprinkling are strictly Genevan in their origin—that is, they were introduced by Calvin at Geneva."—Hist. Bap.

Nothing but the utmost disregard for the truth of history and for the common respect of all Christian scholars and Christian men would induce a man to stand up and put the lie in the lips of Bishop Smith and of all these distinguished historians.

The Lutheran Church Historians, A. D. 1540.

I now bring forward a brilliant array of historians, who, belonging to the Lutheran church, if Eld. Ditzler sees fit to question their veracity it will be the first time they were ever doubted.

Dr. J. L. Mosheim (1695–1755), a noted preacher, theologian and historian, filled professorships in Denmark and Brunswick, and was theological professor and chancellor of the University of Gottingen. He wrote about one hundred and sixty works, and says of the first century :

“The sacrament of baptism was administered in this century, without the public assemblies, in places appointed and prepared for that purpose, and was performed by *an immersion of the whole body in the baptismal font.*”

And of the second century he says :

“The persons that were to be baptized, after they had repeated the creed, confessed and renounced their sins, and particularly the Devil and his pompous allurements, *were immersed under water* and received into Christ's kingdom.”

Also of the fourth century he says :

“Baptismal fonts were now erected in the porch of each church for the more commodious administration of that initiating sacrament.—Maclain's Mosheim, vol. i., pp. 46, 69, 121.

Dr. J. A. W. Neander (1789–1850), the greatest church historian of his age, and theological professor in the University of Berlin for thirty-eight years, says :

“In respect to the form of baptism, it was, in conformity with the original institution, and the original import of the symbol, performed by *immersion*, as a sign of entire baptism into the Holy Spirit, of being entirely penetrated by the same.”*

“Baptism was originally administered by immersion, and many of the comparisons of Paul allude to this form of administration.”

“In his letter to Judd he says :

“As to your question on the original rite of baptism there can be no doubt whatever, that in the primitive times the ceremony was performed by *immersion*, to signify a complete immersion into the new principle of life divine, which was to be imparted by the Messiah. When Paul says, that through baptism we are buried with Christ and rise again with him, he unquestionably alludes to the symbol of dipping into and rising again out of the water. The practice of immersion in the first century was, beyond all doubt, prevalent in the whole church.”—Appendix to Judd's Review of Stuart.

Winer, in his lectures, say : “Affusion was at first applied only to the sick, but was gradually introduced for others, after

* Ch. Hist., vol. i., p. 310, also Hist. Plan. and Train., vol. i., p. 222.

the seventh century, and in the thirteenth became the prevailing practice in the West."*

Van Collen, in his *History of Doctrines*, says:

"*Immersion* in water was general until the thirteenth century; among the Latins it was then displaced by sprinkling, but retained by the Greeks." ‡

Ralph Hospinian (1547–1626), a learned Swiss writer and preacher, who published a *History of the Errors of Popery*, and *History of the Jesuits*, etc., says:

"Christ commanded us to be baptized, by which word it is certain immersion is signified."—*Hist. Sac.*, L. ii, ch. i, p. 30.

Dr. J. C. W. Augusti (1772–1841, a distinguished German author and theologian, and for many years professor of theology in the University of Breslau and Bonn, says:

"The word baptism accords to etymology and to usage, and signifies to immerse, submerge."—Hinton's *Hist. Bap.*, p. 55, Quinter and Snyder Deb., 49.

Augusti, in his *Archæology*, says:

"Immersion in water was general until the *thirteenth century* among the Latins, it was then displaced by sprinkling, but retained by the Greeks." §

J. C. L. Gieseler (1793–1854), a German Church Historian, and theological professor in the University of Bonn and Göttingen, says:

"For the sake of the rich, the rite of sprinkling was introduced."—*Ch. Hist.*, Ger. ed., vol. iii. p. 274.

Dr. John H. Kurtz, born 1809, a professor of theology in the University of Dorpt, author of *Manual of Sacred History*, *The Bible and Astronomy*, *Church History*, etc., says:

"Baptism was administered by complete immersion."—See *Hist. of the Ch.*, p. 72, 119, 226, 227, Clark's ed.

"Baptism was performed (third century) by thrice immersing, during which the formula of baptism was pronounced, sprinkling was only common in case of the rich."—*Ch. Hist.*, p. 119.

* *Lect. Christ. Antiq.*

‡ *Hist. Doct.*, vol. ii, p. 303.

§ *Archæ.* vol. v, p. 5, vol. vii, p. 229.

Prof. J. Bohmer, a Church Historian of note, who died in 1714, says:

"The place of administering baptism was not the church, but a river, in which people were dipped in the presence of witnesses."—In Ingham's Land Book, on Bap., p. 141.

Replication.

I can but feel encouraged at the manifest progress we are making. We rapidly narrow the contested points to their last analysis. My opponent has finally fallen squarely back upon his last and only remaining line of defense, his *tingo*, and I will name it "Fort Tingo." I stated in one of my first speeches, when he was reading the definitions from his lexicons, and finding so much sprinkle in them, that he was rendering those meanings which those old lexicographers indicate in Latin, by *tingo*, by "to *sprinkle*" which was not its accepted meaning when they wrote, not the meaning they intended to convey, as every scholar knows. In this respect, Elder Ditzler HAS IGNORANTLY, if not INTENTIONALLY, MISREPRESENTED EVERY LEXICON HE HAS SO QUOTED. The issue is a plain one, and it shall be plainly treated. Forbearance toward this way of dealing with authors, to the misleading of the people, has ceased to be a virtue.

I repeat my charge, that Eld. Ditzler is either ignorant of the use of the Latin verb *tingo*, by all the old Latin Fathers, ignorant of its use by those German lexicographers who give it as one of the primary definitions of the Hebrew verb *taval* and of the Greek verbs *bapto* and *baptidzo*; ignorant of the opinion of all standard scholars; or else, knowing the facts, he is attempting to take advantage of my *presumed* ignorance, and the credulity of his followers.

The simple question now is, *in what sense did Tertullian and all the earliest Latin Fathers use the verb tingo, when referring to the Christian rite?*

I affirm against Dr. Ditzler, that THEY INVARIABLY USED IT IN THE SENSE OF TO DIP, TO IMMERSE, when referring to the baptismal act. Let us ascertain its signification as we have that of

baptizatio by its *usus loquendi*, the ultimate source of appeal in the early Latin Fathers.

Tertullian, the earliest of the Latin Fathers, who wrote A. D. 150–200, uses *tingo* and *mergo interchangeably*, when he unquestionably means to dip or immerse, as there can be no doubt here, for no standard scholar denies that immersion was the sole baptism at this date.

He says that baptism was administered with great simplicity.

“Homo in aquam demissus, et inter pauca verba tinctus.”

“The man being led down into the water, and between a few words immersed.”

Tinctus is a participle from the verb *tingo*. There can be no mistaking its meaning here.

Quoting Rom. vi. 3, in his sermon on the resurrection of the body, he says

“An ignoratis quod quicumque in Christum Jesum *tincti sumus*, in mortem ejus *tincti sumus*.”

Referring to the commission.

“Et novissimum mandatum ut tingerant in Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum sanctum.”

“And last of all, commanding that they should be immersed into the Father, and the Son and the Holy Spirit.

Tertullian, citing from a vernacular version, which must have been the oldest existing Latin version, quotes the commission, Math. xxviii. 19, thus :

Lex enim *tinguendi* imposita est, et forma prescripta. Ite (inquit) docete nationes *tingentes* eas,” etc., which I translate : “For the law of immersion was imposed and the formula prescribed—Go, he says, teach the nations, immersing them,” etc.

Referring to John iv. 2, he quotes it thus :

“Et non tamen *tingebat* verum discipuli.”

And yet he did not immerse but his disciples. He quotes the apostle Paul thus :

“Non enim me ad tinguendum Christus misit,” etc.

And the Evangelist—

“*Tingebantur* (inquit) confitentes delicta sua.”

“They were *immersed* confessing their sins.”

That no one may doubt that *Tertullian* used *tingo* and *mergo*

interchangeably when speaking of baptism, as we do the verb to dip, to immerse as the fancy might strike him or euphony dictate, I give a few other passages.

On the Soldier's crown, ch 3.:

Dehinc ter mergitur, amplius aliquid respondentem quam Dominus in evangelio determinavit."

Then we are three times *immersed*. Answering somewhat more than the Lord prescribed in the Gospel."

Dr. Halley, of England, says: "They did immerse for they seem as if they could not make too much of holy water. With one immersion not content, they observed trine immersion as the sacramental emblem of the Trinity."

One point is established, immersion was the only action known to these fathers, and therefore when they used *tingo* with reference to baptism they no more meant to sprinkle or pour than they did to stain with some dye.

Now what is the testimony of the honest scholarship of every age as to the meaning of *tingo* when used by Tertullian and the Latin fathers and lexical authorities.

Dr. Hovey, President of Newton Theological Seminary says

"Tertullian seems to have used the verb *tingo* or *tinguo* as if it were the vernacular representative for the Greek word *baptidzo*. *Baptist Quarterly* vol. v p. 77.

Mr. Thelwell, B. A. of Plymouth, England, a translator of the writings of Tertullian meets with *tingo* in some of its forms forty-nine times, and only once translated it sprinkle. Dr. Hovey called his attention to the fact, claiming that in no instance does Tertullian use it in the sense of *to sprinkle*. Mr. Thelwell like a true Christian scholar, admits his mistake and assures Dr. Hovey that he will correct it. I take pleasure in quoting his statement, which is as follows:

"That a translation executed like my own, amid the constant pressure of heavy parochial duties in a large town should contain some inaccuracies in spite of all efforts to the contrary is, I think, only natural; and the only honorable course for a man, if he be shown that he has fallen into an error in such a case, is to retract it without reserve. I gladly do so as to 'tinctus.'"—*B. Q. Vol. v.*

How striking the contrast between this distinguished scholar

an Episcopalian, and that of my opponent's dogmatic assertions respecting the true signification of *tingo* when used by the Latin Fathers, and by lexicographers.

From these facts, you all learn this, that in no one instance in all the writings of Tertullian, known to his translators, whatever Eld. Ditzler, who never read the writings of this author may say to the contrary, does he use *tingo* in any of its forms, in the sense of to sprinkle.

Prof. Toy, of Greenville Seminary, South Carolina, says :

"The lexicons frequently give *tingere* for *baptizein*. As to this, it is agreed among scholars that Tertullian and other Latin writers use *tingere* always in the sense of to immerse."

Prof. Tobey, of Bethel College, Ky., says :

"It seems strange that any one should deny that *tingo* was used with the meaning to dip, by the Latin writers."

A Congregationalist, *Ed. Beecher*, says :

"Tertullian uses *tingo* interchangeably with *mergo* or *mergito* (to immerse). As a corresponding Latin term for baptism, Tertullian used *intinctio*. *Christ. Rev.* 1849 p 241."

M. Stuart says, p 146. He [Tertullian] very often makes use of the Latin word *tingo* in order to express the Greek word *baptidzo*"—which, he says, undoubtedly means to dip, etc.

This is but some of the proof that might be brought forward to prove that *tingo* was used in the second century to mean to dip, to immerse. Who denies it? Who can deny it that is at all familiar with their writings? There is not the shadow of evidence that *tingo* was ever used in this century in the sense of to sprinkle, or to pour upon.

Let us look into the third century. *Cyprian*, who wrote in the third century, quotes Matt. xxviii; 18-20 :

"Ite ergo et docete gentes omnes *tingentes* eas in nomine Patris, &c."

"Go ye therefore and teach all nations, immersing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

He quotes it in the same words in his epistle 63.

He quotes Gal. iii, 27, in these words :

"Nam si non mentitur apostolus dicens, quot quot in Christo *tinxistis* Christum induistis, utique qui illic in Christo baptizatus est induit Christum."

Which I translate—

'For if the apostle lies not when he says, 'as many of you as have been

immersed into Christ have put on Christ, then, verily, he who has been baptized into Christ has put Christ on."—*Conant*.

Beza (sixteenth century) renders the Greek term *bapto*, to dip, by *tingo*—*tineta sanguine* dipped in blood—as our translators have it in Rev., xix, 13.

Stokius renders *bapto* wherever it occurs in the New Testament by *tingo* and *embapto*, by *intingo*, e. g.

"Send Lazurus that"—bapte—*intingat*—he may dip his finger in water." Will sprinkle or pour do here? Luke xvi, 24.

"To whom I give the sop, baptas, (G.), *intingenti* (L.), dipping it." John xiii, 26. Will sprinkle or pour do here?

He was clothed with vesture—*bebammenon* (G.), *tineta* (L.), dipped in blood.

He says perfect pass. *bebammanai* is equivalent to *tinctus sum*.

Embapto he defines by *intingo*—to dip in, e. g., "He who shall dip, *embapsas* (G.), *intinget* (L.), his hand with me into the dish."—Matt. xxvi, 23, and he quotes corresponding passages in Mark and John.

Jerome in the Latin vulgate as in all his writings, invariably uses *tingo* as the Latin synonym, of the Greek verb *bapto*—to dip.

I have said there were none of the old ecclesiastical writers but used *tingo* in the sense of to dip, and invariably when they refer to Christian baptism, but that it is frequently used in this sense in the classics.

I will give a few of the many examples to be found in my boyhood's favorite author, as a specimen of the rest.

Speaking of the operation of the Cyclops forging armor, to which I referred in a former speech, Virgil says :

"alii stridentia tingunt aera lacu;"

"Others dip the hissing brass in the lake." Can Dr. Ditzler work in his dyeing, staining, or sprinkling, or pouring, or moistening in this passage? Does not this one passage alone demonstrate that *tingo* here only means to dip, to plunge? Have you not understood him to make the impression that *tingo*—not *intingo* for he admits that means primarily to dip in—but

the simple verb *tingo* does not primarily mean to dip—never means to dip? He has staked his reputation as an honest scholar upon it. He has boldly put it forth in his published debate, and his readers so understood him.

But let us look again:

“Ensem quem Dauno ignipotens deus ipse parenti Fecerat et stygia candentem tinxerat unda.”—Æ. xii. 91.

“And had dipped the glowing hot sword, which the fire-potent god himself had made for the Daunian father, in the stygian wave”—i. e., water.

Will stain, or sprinkle, will dye, color, or moisten, possibly give the meaning here? Will any other word than “to dip,” “immerse,” or “plunge,” give that meaning? Put Eld. Ditzler upon his honest scholarship, and demand an answer. If he says yes, no one can respect it, and I will send him to the foot of his class. If he answers no, as he must, to answer correctly, then he must recede from his position.

Celsus somewhere speaks of sponges dipped in vinegar, in these words:

“Spongia in aceto *tincta*.”

Will Dr. Ditzler claim that that should be translated dyed, or sprinkled, stained, or poured upon, tinged, or colored in vinegar? He will not presume to do so, though when he has baptism in sight, he can see nothing in *tingo* but dye stuff or sprinkling. He has, I fear, studied one subject too long.

In speaking of the setting of the heavenly bodies, Virgil, as all the poets, Greek and Latin do—describes it as an immersion in the sea—and their rising, as a rising out of it.

“Tingere se oceano properant soles hyberni.”—Virg. Georg. xi. 481.

“The winter suns hasten to dip themselves in the ocean.”

Will sprinkle, or pour upon, color, dye, or stain, moisten, or bedew, serve any purpose here? And yet *tingo*, primarily, never means to dip!

And I recall this.

“Ni roseus fessos jam gurgite Phœbus Hiberno tinget equos, noctemque die labente reducat.”—Vir. Æ. xi. 913.

“Ruddy Phœbus now dips his tired horses in the western deep, and draws the night back, the day gliding away.”

Would Dr. Ditzler, if a teacher in the Vanderbilt, instruct his class to render this color, dye, or stain his horses in the deep? or moisten, sprinkle, or pour them into the western deep, in order to support his cause? Will any present or future professor in the Vanderbilt, endorse Eld. Ditzler's position on this verb? I could multiply similar examples for an hour, but why waste the time? I have given examples enough to satisfy every man who has heard me, or who may read what I have said, except my opponent.

"*Tingo*," Says the learned Grotius, "*properly and generally signifies the same as merso—to dip.*" Is not this sufficiently explicit and authoritative? Will you not regard it as quite equal to the assertion of my opponent, who is intent on making a show of an argument for sprinkling?

Dr. Rice admitted in the Campbell and Rice debate, that *tingo* means to dip, if silence gives consent, for Mr. Campbell claimed and Mr. R. did not deny.

I will now bring forward an authority that my opponent is delighted with, and whose opinions, and even inferences, he never questions, viz :

Dr. Jacob Ditzler, of the Lexington Conference, Ky. In translating a line or two from Ovid, [which by the way he mistranslates] he correctly renders ("*bis flumine corpus tingat*") "twice she dips her body in the stream," [see D. and Wilkes' debate p. 430.] *Tingat* is present tense from *tingo* and why don't he render *tingo* here by stain, color, sprinkle or pour? Why dip here, if dip is not its primary meaning—if it never means dip!

Dr. Ed. Beecher, author of "*Import of Baptism*" says :

"*Tingo* beyond all doubt, means to immerse. In this sense Facciolatus and Forcellinus, in their *Totius Latinitatis lexicon* give *baptidzo* as its synonym, and again with more emphasis—

"But to prove that it means to immerse is needless; no one can deny it."

Dr. Beecher was mistaken—there is one man on this continent who will presume to do so, and I am compelled to say, that man is Eld. Ditzler. I will not say that he intentionally misrepresents this matter, but that he has most egregiously done so in order to support his absurd position that *baptidzo*

primarily means to sprinkle, and that all the oldest versions translated it by verbs that mean to sprinkle. He says this in defiance of the united testimony of all antiquity and of all scholars. Thus, therefore, we are justified in concluding that whenever lexicographers give *tingo* and *intingo* as the primary meaning of the Hebrew verb *taval* or of *bapto* or *baptidzo*, they intend to denote to dip, to dip in—and to represent them as defining it by to sprinkle is to manifestly misrepresent them.

Smith's English Latin Dictionary, Harper & Bros., 1871, gives as the Latin synonyms of our English word to dip, *mergo*, and *tingo*, dip (subs.) *immersion*.

Now give to dip, to immerse, as the proper definition to *tingo*—wherever he has quoted a lexicon giving this as the definition of *baptidzo* or *taval*, and you see that they tell us that “to dip,” “to immerse,” is the proper signification of these verbs—his Schindler, and Leigh, and Stokius, and Castell, “though equal to twenty in one,” all with one voice say “to dip,” “to immerse” is the *primary* and *proper* meaning—“to sprinkle,” never. The figurative meanings—“to moisten,” “to wet,” do not mean “to sprinkle,” and therefore do his cause no good.

Thus we see his last fort is carried, his last shadow of defence taken from him by the concurrent testimony of all scholars:

That *tingo* is used in the sense of “to dye,” “to color,” I have admitted and no one denies, but I do affirm that where used with reference to the act of Christian baptism, or as a definition of *bapto* or *baptidzo*, it invariably denotes immersion.

You heard him quote Calvin as one of the Latin Fathers! Well he wrote in Latin, and was the father of Presbyterianism, but Calvin does not use *tingo* anywhere in the sense of “to sprinkle,” though Eld. Dizzler strives to make the impression upon you that he does—or why does he quote from Calvin at all? Calvin uses it in the sense of baptism merely, and he is such a good witness for us. I will read the whole sentence in which *tingo* occurs, and you will perceive he first states his *opinion* that it, the act, is indifferent—and then states a *fact*, that bears directly upon this question. I have him here in Latin, but will give the translation, published by the Presbyterian Board, Philadelphia: “Whether the person who is

baptized "*tingitur*" be wholly immersed, *mergitur*, and whether thrice or once, or whether water be only poured on him, is of no importance [who told him so—when Christ commanded him to be immersed?] Churches ought to be left at liberty in this respect [why not then in every thing else that Christ commanded as well?] to act according to the difference of countries [but Christ made no exceptions and what right have we?] THE VERY WORD *baptidzo*, HOWEVER, SIGNIFIES TO IMMERSE; AND IT IS CERTAIN THAT IMMERSION WAS THE PRACTICE OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH."

This ought to be conclusive evidence with all Presbyterians that immersion was the act which Christ commanded for baptism.

For the testimony of the versions, ancient and modern, I refer all to what I submit, in the Appendix that we have mutually agreed to annex at the close of this proposition.

I have something more to say touching Liddell & Scott's Greek Lexicon, which my opponent has so grossly misrepresented.—[*Time out.*

DR. DITZLER'S SEVENTEENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—Dr. Graves once more brings up *tingo*. We presumed he was satisfied with it. He says it is “just like *bapto*.” Grant it, then, and is it not ruinous to his cause. Let us have, then,

1. The lexicons on *tingo*—the standards.

Leverett's Freund—best. “*Tingo*, to wet, moisten; *tengo*, *brecho*, *hugraino*, to moisten, to bedew.” Then come derived meanings, “bathe, wash, dip in, plunge, immerse, color, stain, tinge, tint.” That is exactly the order, confirming all my rules on philology. His is the first of critical Latin lexicons.

Take your's I see there, Andrews, “*Tingo*, to wet, moisten, (B) to soak or color, to dye, color, tinge.”

AINSWORTH.—“To dye, color, stain. 2 To sprinkle, to imbrue. 3. Wash. 4. Paint.”

ANTHON.—“Moisten, wet.”

WHITE.—“Moisten, wet.”

2. Let us give a few occurrences of *tingo* in Latin contemporary with apostolic times or thereabouts. “By chance his hounds, led by the blood-stained track (*tincta*).” The ground is sprinkled, stained, with the wounded stag as it runs. Any dip here? “Wet, (*tingere*) the body (*aqua aspersa*) with sprinkled water.” Any dip there? He tells the mode of *tingoing* it, *aspersa*, by sprinkling the water. Yet you say *tingo* is the same as *bapto*. I believe it myself. We could multiply examples. See our citations of it Lou. Deb., pp. 429, 430.

3. That you may see how the Fathers used it, we quote—

1. CALVIN.—“That it is of no importance whether all who are baptized (*tingati*) are immersed (*mergantur*), and that thrice or once, or water is only poured on them.” Inst. Calvin, lib. iv. ch. xv., sec. 19.)

2. Archbishop Sebastian, of Mentz—“Then let the priest take the child in his left arm, and holding him over the font, let him, with his right hand, three several times take water out of the font and pour it on the child's head (*itaquod aqua tingat caput et scapulas*), so that the water may wet (*tingat*) its head and shoulders.” (Wall 577.)

3. Jerome interchanges *conspergo*, sprinkle, and *tingo*.

Here you see that both Calvin and the Catholic Archbishop use "pour water on" as the mode by which *tingo* is effected. We could multiply examples. The above three are surely representative. Where Schindler uses *tingo* it is often where tears and dew fall on the object, and Furst uses *tingo* in his Latin, and defining the same word in German in the same way, uses *benetzon*, moisten. Why do not our opponents look at these facts, and guard against such repeated blunders?

Again we call up some Versions.

III.—JEROME, ITALIA, ÆTHIOPIC.

Vulgate and Itala. 1. Transfer *baptidzo*. 2. Translate *tabhal baptidzo*. 2. Kings v. 14, *lavo*—wash, besprinkle.

3. Translate *bapto*, *aspergo*, (*beammenos*, *aspersa*), Rev. xix. 13, that is sprinkle.

4. *Tzeva*, baptized by, (1) *Conspergatur*, (2) *Infunderis*, sprinkle, besprinkle.

IV.—ÆTHIOPIC.

1. It has a word for immerse, *maab*, "overflow, immerse." It is never used for baptism.

2. *Bapto* is rendered sprinkle. Rev. xix. 13

3. *Katharismos*, purification, is rendered by baptism. John iii. 25.

4. Renders *baptidzo* by *tamank*, to baptize.

CASTELL.—" *Tamank*, to be baptized, to baptize."

4. Renders *baptidzo* by *mo*, *mio*, "water." It is the same root with *moh*, "sprinkled with water, pour rain, water, juice, liquid, water."—Castell.

V.—EGYPTIAN. Same as the above.

VI.—COPTIC. Third century.

1. *Bapto*, sprinkle. Rev. xix. 13.

2. *Baptidzo* by *tamaka*. See Ethiopic above.

3. *Baptidzo* by *tamash*, applied to affusion, tears. Psalm vi. 6.

VII.—EGYPTIAN. Third century.

1. *Baptidzo* rendered *oms*—water, wash, wet, sprinkle, same root as *amad*.

VIII.—Basmuric. Third century.

1. *bapto*, sprinkle.

2. Transfers *hantidzo*

IX.—Sahidic. 1. *Bapto*, sprinkle. 2. Transfers *baptidzo*.

X.—Persic. 1. *Gutha* is immerse, but never baptize.

2. *Shusta shustidan*, wash, baptize, never immerse or dip.

3. *Suhar, shue*, “give a bath or administer a washing, (*i. e.* pour the water for it,) to fall in drops of water, to distill, to baptize.”

5. It renders purifying, John iii. 25, baptism.

6. *Baptidzo* is rendered by a word used in Exodus ii. 5, where the daughter of Pharaoh went to wash *epi* at the river; and Gen. xviii. 4, with “a little water;” John xiii. 10, washed, *i. e.*, feet. All did not plunge into the same water their feet, it defiled by touch of some needing purification.

XI.—Luther, 1522.

1. *Bapto*, sprinkle, *besprengt*. Rev. xix. 13.

2. *Baptidzo*, *waschen*. Mark vii. 4; Luke xi. 38, etc.

3. *Baptidzo*, *taufen*, baptize, when he and the Germans always baptized by affusion, used it, therefore, exactly as we do baptize, as if transferring *baptidzo*.

XII.—Lusitanian.

1. *Bapto*, *salpacado*, sprinkle. Rev. xix. 13.

2. *Baptidzo*, wash. Mark vii. 4, etc.

3. *Baptidzo* transferred.

XIII. and IV.—Italian and French. Wash, transfer, where the ordinance occurs as Christian baptism.

SUMMARY ON VERSIONS.

1. For the first fifteen hundred years after Christ no version rendered *baptidzo* dip or immerse.

2. Nearly all—all the best—render *bapto* by sprinkle.

3. Wherever they render baptize by a word of any mode, by modal words, in every case it is a word of affusion.

4. All the earliest and best, save Itala and Vulgate, translate *baptidzo* by words meaning to sprinkle—these two, Itala and Vulgate, transfer, but render Chaldee of baptize by sprinkle, as well as *bapto*.

XV.—VERSIONS.

1. The two oldest manuscript Bibles in the world, Sinaitic and

Vatican, about A. D. 325, translated *baptisontai* by *rantisontai*, sprinkle themselves for baptize themselves. Mark vii. 4. The copyists, learned Greeks, knew it was by sprinkling, hence translate it instead of transferring, as it was Jewish, traditional baptism, and always by sprinkling. *Baptidzo* applies to many modes.

2. Seven others, ancient copies, have it sprinkle.

3. Euthymus, a learned Greek of the 4th century, has it the same. Dr. Graves asked why it was translated sprinkle, *rantidzo*, if *baptidzo* meant sprinkle? *Baptidzo* means to sprinkle, and applies to sprinklings, but like so many words we have seen and one, *tingo*, we just saw, it applies to other processes also, is a far more extended word in meaning than *rantidzo*; hence it is reduced by these translators to one definite mode there. They would not allow any substitute for *baptidzo* in Greek, as the word for baptism is a Christian rite.

And Furst is a now wild infidel of Germany. What was their favorite Gesenius, but half infidel, half transcendentalist and rationalist? Where is the proof of Furst being infidel? He has done more for philology and for the better study of the Bible in Hebrew than any man since Buxtorff and Castell, two hundred years ago.

But the Doctor thinks they have big pools in the Syriac church somewhere, and that points to immersion. Now, 1. *We adduce the proof of all we introduce as argument.* Have you noticed that? The Doctor tells you this and that, and *nine cases out of ten* we refute it *whenever* he introduces his proof or it is at hand. All our authorities are in hand. But we showed

1. That the Syriac lexicons were all against him, and the application of his big pool.

2. All the versions are against it. Catafago, like Castell (must I repeat it the twentieth time), uses *amaul*—spells it in English just that way—whose only definition is “the being wet with rain.” That is secular, daily use. So Castell defines it, having natives of the East to help him, and two native lexicons of the ninth and tenth centuries as a foundation, both in Syriac while it was a living language.

3. A big pool twelve or eighteen hundred years after Christ is late in the day to tell what was ordained in the Commission.

4. We saw that the Syriac Council, discussing *amad* as to the proper person of the verb, incidentally twice use *sprinkle*. We quoted it once; put it in evidence.

5. We saw that Syriac writers of the third and fourth centuries call shedding tears, baptizing, shedding blood, baptizing.

6. We saw that they held that John caught some of the water that flowed down Christ's body when he was baptized, and it was divided out among the twelve apostles for baptizing. This showed (1) that they believed the apostles baptized by affusion. (2) That Christ was so baptized. We have the Syriac works for all this. It is copied in the Louisville Debate.

7. Better than all, the version made in the apostles' age sustains it all, and shows that they used their Syriac words for baptize where the clearest cases of sprinkling and pouring are named, falling of tears and rain on objects, while they translate *tabhat*, Hebrew for baptize, by sprinkle. They translated sprinkle, baptize, and baptize, sprinkle. Surely that shows what they believed.

We have adduced all the proof needed on the age of the versions of the Peshito. We quote one sentence from an ancient Syriac writer, Bibliotheca Orientalis Assemani, tom. iii, p. 212. "But the rest of the Old Testament (books) and of the New Testament were translated with great pains and accuracy by Thaddeus and the other apostles." There is no shadow of proof against this. Were we disposed, and were it necessary to urge it, we feel perfectly able to vindicate this as the correct view. All agree it is the best, the purest, the oldest, the most literal of all versions of the Bible extant. How came it to be so unless by apostolic aid?

He reads those old, unreliable products of Barnabas, put in the middle of the second century by all the best historians now, and admitted to be in great doubt as to when and by whom written. They amount to nothing, and say not a

word about immersion. The first Father that names "mer-sion" is Tertullian—trine immersion—to absorb the grace of God fully out of the water. He admits perfusion, sprinkling, as repeatedly we have shown.

But Novatian's baptism is up. But you surely know it is most falsely reported in immersion books. It does not say, as they quote it, "if that can be termed baptism." It reads: "If indeed (*ei ge chrae*), it be proper (or becoming) (*legein*) to say that such a person (*ton toionton*) (masculine gender, referring to the man himself—one as wicked, possessed as held they him to be, with the devil—so it says) could receive it"—that is baptism. Deny that reading if you dare, and say *ton toionton* refers to baptism as its antecedent. It declares of baptism, he did receive it (*elaben*). If the doubt was on the mode, as he lived, became a bishop, headed a sect claimed by Baptist successionists as a Baptist, why did not they immerse him? The very fact that he never was immersed, nor the mode questioned, is proof enough that all the church admitted sprinkling as baptism, superstitious as some were becoming, not as to mode, but the quantity of water used. And he thinks they poured it all over him in bed, where he was sick, to come as near immersion as possible, as he was too low to undergo immersion! Isn't that rich? Just think of it, having a deluge of water on a man in bed, who is too delicate, too far gone to be put in a trough of water! Would not the wet clothes kill him at once? Alas for dip!

Remembering that Origen, Basil, Clemens Alexandrinus, A. D. 190, all vindicate pouring and sprinkling as baptism, as Greek Fathers, then a number of others we gave, and Tertullian as a Latin, as also Cyprian, 251, Jerome, the learned translator of the Vulgate, fourth century, commenting on Ezekiel xxxvi, 25: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you," says, "So that upon those who believe and are converted from error, I might pour out the clean water of baptism." In a word, Tertullian quotes where the apostles' feet were washed by Christ, Cyprian, Jerome, Origen, and Latin and Greek Fathers too numerous to be quoted now, quote this verse, and Isaiah xlv, 3, "Pour water on him that is thirsty,"

as proofs that Messiah would baptize. They always appeal to such verses for their authority to baptize. Would it not be strange for learned men to quote Num. xix, 13, "Water of sprinkling;" Ezek. xxxvi, 25, "Sprinkle clean water upon you," to prove the right and authority to immerse? Yet, the Fathers of the first four centuries do this constantly. Not only so, but Clemens Alexandrinus, A. D. 190, calls "sprinkling one's body with water" the likeness of Mosaic baptism. We read it as it is in a former speech, [12th]

He thinks I made a mistake about Tertullian. No, no; no mistake yet. In all these matters we are careful. We render the Latin of the writers just as they intended. Some use their words a little differently from others. It requires much familiarity with the old Fathers of the first few centuries to know just what they did mean, and a mere reference to a lexicon of classic Latin is liable to deceive, since they do not define the monkish Latin of late ages at all. Some few come down to Augustine, fourth century, on a few words.

Once more we quote the lexicons on the Hebrew word for baptize, viz: *tabhal*, and give the root force of the word.

Tabhal—baptize—*baptidzo*.

1. *Tabhal* is translated by *baptidzo*. LXX. 2 K. v. 14.
2. *Tabhal* was and is used by Jews for proselyte baptism.
3. *Tabhal* is rendered by the Seventy by *bapto* generally, often.
4. The Targums translate *rachats*, wash, pour, by *tabhal* at times.
5. *Tabhal* is the oldest occurrence of baptize by 1000 years.

I. Lexicons on *tabhal*, *tebhal*.

1. Schindler *tabhal*, tinxit, intinxit immersit, moisten, dip, immerse ita lavit, ut res non mundetur, sed tantum attingat humorem vel tota, vel ex parte, baptizavit. Thus to wash, as the object is not purified, but merely touches the moisture in whole or in part, is to baptize.

2. Stokius: tinxit. intinxit immersit, ut attingat, humorem ex toto, aut saltem, ex parte, moisten, dip, etc., as it merely touches the liquid in whole or in part.

3. Leigh's "Crit. Sac.:" *tinxit*, int. *immersit*, ita *lavit*, ut *res non mundetur*, sed *tantum attingat humorem vel toto, vel ex parte, baptizavit*. Moisten, dip, immerse; thus to wash, as the object is not purified, but merely touches the liquid in whole or in part, is to baptize.

4. Castell, equivalent to nineteen lexicographers, nay twenty as Kimchi, whom Gesenius, the favorite immersion lexicographer on Hebrews, called the classic lexicographer, says the same, centuries ago said it. Castell defines as the rest, only with more pains and fullness, *moisten, dip, immerse*. But he lets us know what the dip implies, *intinxit* through moistening, hence "dips or dabble" he gives as its English, the dipping (*intinctio*) merely touches the object to the liquid in part or in whole, (*con* and *tango*, to touch.) He shows that in later times, (posterior,) it was (among Rabbins,) "to immerse, but not always."

5. Buxtorff, the elder one, tells us likewise it is merely "sprinkled by the water," or touched. He uses a word that means to touch and sprinkle both, (*contingatur ob aqua*.)

6. FURSTIANUS.—"Regare, tingere, perfundere, immergere, *moisten, wet, sprinkle, immerse*."

Later Lex. Ger., by Same.—To *moisten, wet, to sprinkle; regare, tingere, therefore, to dip, to immerse*. The fundamental signification of the stem *bal* is, to *moisten, besprinkle*."

Let us now test the root meaning of this word. *Bal* is its root syllable. Now, whatever meaning constantly reappears in the root, is its primary meaning.

THE ROOT OF TABHAL.

The root suggested by Gesenius, is *tab*. His Thesaurus (Heb. Lois. 1835-6, and Heb. Lex. by Robinson) give *tab* as the root.

Gesenius.—"The primary syllable, *tab*, depth, immersion. Compare Goth. *diup*, Eng. deep, Ger. *tief*; also Goth. *daufen*, Ger. *taufen*, Eng. dip, Gr. *duplo* and softened *deuo*."

Again :

"*Tamal*, prim. immerse."

Rabbi Wise endorses Gesenius, who puts it "dip wholly or partly," he says, which spoils all for them.

1. Gesenius, *Essay on Helps to Philology in Bib. Repos.* 1833. G. M. Stuart, *Arabic*, 1st of all, etc. Why all this Aryan (no Semitic) helps?

2. Where in the Bible, does *tabhal* express depth, or a deep thorough immersion? Nowhere.

3. He puts *tab—deuo*—sprinkle, moisten. How of that?

4. Where can he find *tab* in any Semitic tongue expressing depth or immerison? Not once.

Let us examine a few words with *tab* as root.

1. "*Natab, Stillavit gutta*, shed drops." Lexicons generally.

2. "*Shatab*, Ethiopic. *Distillavit gutta*." Same as the other.

3. *Ratib, hudrainin madefaceri*, (Gesenius,) to wet, moistened with rain (Job xxiv. 8), also with juice."

4. "*Nataph*, root, *tab*; To drop, fall in drops, distill, Arab., watering, irrigating. (Gesenius.)

5. "*Tiuph*, root, *tsaph—i. e. tab*. To pour, to pour out, irrigate."

6. "*Shataph*, root, *tab*. To gush or pour out." (Gesenius and others.)

7. "*Tsah—i. e. tab*. Arabic, *tsaba*. (Freyta, Gesenius, etc.) To pour, pour out (fudit, effudit.)"

Now what becomes of Gesenius' suggested root? It crushes him.

Bal is the true root of *tabhal*, as Furst shows.

1. We have seen that the universal law of language is, to increase in strength, words.

2. That the process is from sprinkle, to dip, etc.

3. *Bal* is clearly the root of *tabhal*.

Then [1] *bal la*, Hebrew and Arabic.

Freytag.—"To moisten, and especially to make wet by sprinkling or light affusion of liquids."

2. Gesenius.—"To moisten, make wet by affusion of liquid, sprinkle."

3. Schindler.—"Sprinkle."

4. Leigh.—"Sprinkle."

5. Castell.—Same as Freytag.

(2) *Phaphal*, root, *bal*, Gesenius. Buxtorff, Ges., Castell, all "sprinkle" (consperisit).

- (3) *Balal*, the root is *bal*. "Sprinkle." See my first speech.
- (4) *Naphal*, *bal* is the root. Terginus, "*effundo*." Castell, "pour out."
- (5) *Shaphal*, *bal*, the root. "To flow, to pour. Furst, Ar., "to rain, &c,"
- (6) *Abal*, *bal* is the root. "Rain." Ar., moisten."
- (7) *Bal*. Rain.
- (8) *Bul*, *ball* the root. "To flow, stream forth copiously, to moisten."
- (9) *Mabal*, Arabic, *ma-bal-a*. "To flow copiously, to moisten.
- (10) *Ya bal*, *bal* the root. "To flow, to stream. (Furst.)
- (11) *Wa-bal*. "To pour rain, to rain copiously, etc."
- (12) *Ya-bal*. "To flow, stream, to pour, drop down, moisten." (Furst.)

Here now, after examining the only two syllables, the only two possible roots, both destroy the immersion theory. It demonstrates further the absolute truth of what I had the satisfaction of discovering in Greek, Arabic and Syriac, that sprinkle was the primary meaning of each of those words for baptize. What Furst was doing in Hebrew across the waters, I had the honor of doing in Syriac, Greek and Arabic, yes, on an infinitely broader basis than he, we had demonstrated that the whole philology of language demonstrated this great truth, that the process in all languages was from sprinkle to dip, overwhelm, immerse, never reversing the law. Wherever the *bap* is, says A. Campbell, there is the dip. *Bap* is the root syllable, the stem word in all the forms of *bapto* and *baptidzo*. So *bal* is the root syllable, stem, of all these twelve words in Hebrew, all being as nearly related to baptize, (*tabhal*) as *bapto*, *baptistæ*s, *baphæ*, *baptisma*, *baptismos*, etc., are to *baptidzo* in Greek. Hence you see affusion, moistening by dew, drops of water, etc., run through all those words of the same root. Hence sprinkle is the primary meaning of baptize in Hebrew as well as Greek.

But once more the Doctor shrinks under the fearful weight of Furst. Why does he not attack Buxtorff, Castell, Stokius, Schindler, Kimchi, Leigh—all these who essentially assert

the same—that *tabhal* even when it is to *dip*, it “merely *touches* the object to the liquid?” Is not *that* as damaging as *Furst*? The truth is, this great German occupies such a dazzling height on the supernal throne of elevated scholarship and criticism—has ascended such a magnificent pyramid of his own building—has earned such a glorious fame, that the height thereof so bedazzles our opponent in his groveling depths below, that his eyes are holden—bedimmed with the fog and mists of error, and walled so, that he can never realize the position of independence and learning to which the greatest philologist of this century arose.

After the dose we administered to Dr. Graves in the last three speeches, we cannot expect him to be in the sweetest temper and coolest frame of mind. It makes a chronic patient wonderfully sick to dose him so strongly. But it is the only remedy for a long seated disease, sometimes. So bear up, Doctor, though we probe deeply, heal closely, salt and pepper profusely and bleed you as closely as the old son of Hippocrates did in *Gil Blas*.

My lectures over the Southwest hurt. My “big books” hurt. Stokius hurts. All hurts. Syriac hurts. Hebrew hurts. Yes, and they will hurt on. We will ply the lash on error till we whip it to its den.

He puts it mildly indeed that now he makes me say that A. Campbell, Dr. Graves, etc., did not give all that Schleusner said. That would be silly. What I did say was that, Dr. Graves, both in his lexical citations, July 4, 1868, and during this debate, left out *the very words and texts* that I omitted, with this difference: I gave *the* signs of omission. My opponent, and all of us, know the omitted words had nothing to do with the real meaning of Schleusner. I gave *every word* of his definitions. This he dare not deny. But Dr. Graves omits: 1. These very words that I omit. 2. He omits the explanation Schleusner gave, that *baptidzo* does not occur in the New Testament in the sense of dip, immerse, plunge, but in the sense of wash, cleanse, purify, and this by any of the modes—pouring, sprinkling, immersing.

3. Dr. Graves omits the word “pour forth” in Schleusner.

How now does he excuse himself? He says: "We only proposed to give what he [S.] declares to be the primary and proper definition of *baptidzo*." Indeed! That is not the case. In the same chapter or article, you use these words: "Observe that *not one* of these Pedobaptist authors and lexicographers gives sprinkle or pour as a definition of *baptidzo*." In last week's paper, "*The Baptist*," by Dr. Graves, he asserts: "Thirty-two Greek lexicons define *baptidzo*, to dip, plunge, or immerse, and NOT ONE OF THEM defines it to pour or to sprinkle." Now, we have seen that all the great standards give sprinkle or pour, or both, save the abridgments of Stephanus, born under immersion rule. Yet he never gives dip as a meaning at all. He never gives immerse as a Bible meaning. He gives wash, cleanse—*abluo*, *luo*—as its only New Testament meanings. But Passow, Suicer, Stokius, Schleusner, Schneider, Rost and Palm—*twenty-five* authorities define it sprinkle or pour, or both. Schneider, a great German, 1819, gives its *general* meanings as equivalent to *brecho*—sprinkle, shed forth. Passow gives its *general* meaning as "sprinkle upon, pour upon." Leigh, its primary, as wash—or any mode whatever. Rost and Palm give—"generally to sprinkle upon, pour upon."

Stokius tells us that though in his estimation it meant dip, immerse, yet by a metalepsis, it come to mean "to wash, to cleanse, because anything is accustomed to be dipped or immersed in water, that it may be washed or cleansed, although, also, the washing can, and generally is, effected BY SPRINKLING THE WATER. Mark vii. 4; Luke xi. 38. HENCE *it is transferred* to the sacrament of *baptism*." Then follow a lot of texts in Matthew, Luke, etc. Now look at his facts. Because it came to mean to *wash*, then *wash* by *sprinkling*, and *because* it was "*accustomed to be done by sprinkling the water—adspersendo aquam*." Hence it is transferred to the sacrament of baptism, and he cites a host of texts in the gospels for *that* use of it. Beza argues the same way exactly. So does Witsius, Terretinus, Vossius and Suicer. Yet *all* of them hold to affusion. Beza held that John "poured" the water on them. Witsius, Terretinus, etc., held that Acts xi. 41, and in the baptism of Cornelius, Paul, Lydia, the Jailor—all was by

affusion. So they declare, as we quoted them, already. Yet they argued exactly as Stokius and Schleusner do. [See the full quotations of Stokius and Schleusner in my first speech, 28, 29, 30]. Then Stokius tells us of its metaphorical application. "Metaphorically, it designates the pouring out of the Holy Spirit upon the apostles and other believers * * * *since anciently* the water was copiously poured upon those baptized, or they were immersed deep in the water," etc. Here its *metaphorical* use is where it applies to the *Spirit*, that *based* on its *literal* use—pouring water copiously on those baptized. Now, where is the metaphorical about *sprinkling* and *pouring* water on people? Where is the metaphor? It is simply a most daring effort to befog your minds and suppress the clear record of facts. What does he offer to overcome this? He cites, under the noun, a word never used by Christ of this ordinance ordained in the commission—never used in apostolic preaching, a single time as to the ordinance of Christian baptism—a *later* word than *baptidzo* by five hundred years and more; and Stokius, defining it, is far less full here, as he had just defined the older and far more important word—*baptidzo*—the only word used by him for his ordinance of baptism—he then uses the words quoted by Dr. Graves; *and not a text cited in the Bible in that connection* to show it was a New Testament use—the immerse. On the contrary, he tells us when it came to mean "to be washed or cleansed," hence it was transferred to designate the first sacrament of the New Testament.

He then tells us they call it "*initiatio*," "namely baptism; which they call the initiation, in which those to be baptized were formerly immersed into water, though at this time the water is only sprinkled upon them etc," I give Dr. Graves' rendering. See his last speech, as well as 15th. Now here when they immersed "formerly" who does not see that he alludes to the ages after the apostles? It was in the days when they used the term "*initiate*." Who reads of 'initiation' in the New Testament baptism? Under *baptidzo*, Christ and the apostles' ONLY word in ALL cases of baptizing or *commanding* or *practicing* it, we see S. says it was "*by sprinkling the water*." *because* they poured it on copiously, from *that* use of it, it came

to be applied to the *Spirit* descending on the people. Now what fearful suppressions, what torture to record and truth is resorted to by controversialists to get rid of those damaging facts? Here S. tells nothing of "*they* call it initiation" and all that jargon of the dark age immersionists.

Every man can see that Dr. Graves is simply stung to fury when he tries to fix on me the idea suppressing(?) He wants to joke really.

And now comes again Schleusner. We exposed Dr. Graves enough in our last two speeches or three, God knows. Indeed we pity him. Our friends know it. It hurts him so badly we hate to do it. But duty compels.

Dr. Graves re-asserts that I do not rightly interpret Schleusner. Now it is only a question in this case of understanding an author. Dr. Wilkes and I, both took the same view so far as *this* part omitted by him, by me, by A. Campbell, Ingham and Dr. Graves is concerned. I was the first who ever gave these lexicons in full to the reading world on this question. My full exposure of Dr. Graves' view, is in speech 15th., and need not be repeated. I add this, in view of Dr. Graves' additional blunders. Dr. Graves says: *tabha* [immerse] is used in the two [Psalms lxviii. 5, ix. 6.] referred to in the sense of *to destroy by overflowing*; and Schleusner declares that in *this* sense, *i. e.* 'to drown, to perish by the submersion,' it is never used in the New Testament.

He is endorsed by Drs. Varden, Talbert, Breaker, and Boyce "one of the ripest scholars of this age." Boyce writes a letter endorsing Dr. Graves's position. All right. Now for the form.

Here is the *real* test of *accuracy, judgment and criticism*. I ask no help but that of Truth. But if I fail, Drs. Horn, Pritchett, Prof. Newman, Elder Cox, will come to my aid—Bros. Bailey and McFarland will not desert, while I've tried Dr. M. R. Jones before.

My friends, to appreciate the trap Dr. Graves has fallen in, the snare he is caught in, you must know that the Psalms are *chaptered and versed differently* in Hebrew to what they are in English. Schleusner refers to Psalms lxviii. 5, and ix. 5, as

the places where in Symmachus an unknown translator translates *tabha* by *baptidzo*, I have all these Versions. Now it so happens that in Ps. ix. 6, James' version, "*destructions*" are named as coming on people. Hence Dr. Graves has been led to look at that as the *tabha*, and renders it "to destroy by *overflowing*." "Hence they *perish* by submersion." What are the facts?

1. Dr. Graves and his aids blunder into the ditch exactly as those *tabha* immerses. The places in *our* version where this *tabha* occurs are Psalms ix. 15. "The heathen [*tabha*—Greek of Schleusner—*baptidzo*] *are sunk down* in the pit they made." No one *perishes* here. It is simply calamities and pits they sink into. The other is Psalms lxix. 2, in James' version, "*sink (tabha)* in deep mire." Here is no submersion—no going clear under, no *dip*, no *perishing*. Here then these men blunder all the way through, and become victims of *tabha* themselves. *Zalha* never means anything but immerse—never in all the Bible. It never means dip. No lexicon ever so defined it, and they would have been false if they had. It never applies to overflowing. In *neither* case given by Schleusner does the objects *perish*—die as the effect of *tabha*. So all their smoke is cleared away. Now then they make S. say in the sense of *tabha*, *baptidzo* never occurs in the New Testament, but it does *very frequently* in Greek writers, *e. g.* Diodorus Siculus, of the overflowing of the Nile, etc. Now it so happens that *baptidzo* NEVER occurs in any Greek writer known, in the sense it does in these two Psalms. Where does it mean "sink down into a pit"—"sink in deep mire," referring to inextricable troubles and sorrows? Nowhere in "Greek writers." Hence these men make the Greek critic speak like an ignoramus, and say what would convict him of egregious ignorance. But this is not the only vexatious trouble in which they are involved. They say that it means *baptidzo* does occur in the New Testament in the sense of *tabhal*.

But 1. In no instance in all the Bible does *tabhal* immerse, envelop or cover up the object.

2. All great lexicographers tell us even when it means dip, (*tingo*) "it MERELY TOUCHES the object to the liquid in part or in whole." It *never* envelops or puts the object under the

element. So this ruins their position. They insist "hac" must refer to the *last* word, *tabha*, because in *classic* Latin especially where two such words as *hac* and *illa*, or *hoc*, *illud* occur, the *hic*, *haec*, *hoc*, refers to the latter. But (1) this is in *classic* use. (2) It is not rigidly followed, but often reversed. (3) The common Latin often reverses, as Selden does. See speech 15, 4, 4. It makes Selden say what is false and absurd.

Let us construct a sentence and apply this rule of theirs.

Tertullian uses *tingo* as we do baptize, the Germans *taufen*, and under *tingo* he places as species of it *perfun-do*, *adspergo*, *lavo*, *mergo*. But in this sense, *in hac autem*, etc., it never occurs in Ovid, Virgil or Horace. Or I say, *tingo*, to baptize, administer baptism, and answers to *baptidzo* in Matt. xxviii, 19 and to *taufen*, Luther's Version, Matt. iii, 16; Luke iii, 16-21, but in this sense it never occurs in Virgil, Horace, etc., but does very often in Cyprian and the Christian Fathers, etc. To what must the word "this sense" refer? Certainly to *both* baptize and administer baptism, the whole meaning. Hence "hac" refers to a united meaning—to the definitions as *one*, not to the references. In no book on earth making a definition with mere references, and *not one* of *them* defined, could it be held as interpreted by those men.

To further their cause, in speech 15 he changes the punctuation, leaves out a very important word, and thus helps to conceal the sense. In his last he drops "*autem*," to help conceal it further, adds a word that is not in S., and thus seeks to destroy the sense.

Here is Schleusner: *Baptidzo*, properly.—I immerse or dip, I plunge into water, from *bapto*, and answers to the Hebrew *tabhal*, 2 Kings, v, 14, in the Alexandrian version, and *tabha* in Symmachus. Ps. lxviii, 5, and in an uncertain one, Ps. ix, 6. But in this sense it never occurs in the New Testament," etc.

Clearly this tells us *baptidzo* does not occur in the sense of dip, immerse, in the New Testament. If it were still in doubt, he dissipates it by showing that from his view *baptidzo* meant dip or immerse in water in *classic* Greek, and *thence* came to

mean *wash, cleanse*, so he urges and says. It then means *wash, cleanse*. So says S., hence applied to baptism.

He then quotes where a number of manuscripts read *sprinkle* for baptize, and they include the two oldest Bibles in the world, in Mark vii, 4. Thus he shows this washing was by sprinkling also, as well as by immersing. Then he tells us it is "to administer to, give to one copiously, to pour forth," etc.

Finally, all that old school of writers who urge exactly the same argument S. does on *baptidzo*, some naming *tabhal* also, Beza and Suicer, *e. g.*, when they come to tell of Apostolic baptism tell us it was by pouring, etc. Beza is far less favorable to our side, seemingly, when defining his ideas of how it means to wash. Yet he held that John also baptized by "*pouring*." So of Witsius, Stokius, etc.

The testimony of Stokius is that because, by a *metalepsis baptidzo* means *wash, cleanse*, and *because* the cleansing and washing *was actually* performed "by sprinkling the water," and this sprinkling the water for purification or cleansing was practiced by Jews for centuries, Mark vii, 4; Luke xi, 38, *because* they were accustomed to *thus* cleanse, "hence, (*hinc*) because of *this fact*, it (*baptidzo*) is transferred to the Sacrament of baptism." Hence "*metaphorically* it designates the pouring out of the Holy Spirit."

Why this *metaphorical* use? Why does *baptidzo* thus occur in the Gospels, and Epistles, and Acts? Hear him. "Since anciently the water was copiously poured upon those baptized or they were immersed deep into the water," etc. Now when S. bases his *metaphorical* use of *baptidzo*—"pour out" ON THE ACTUAL FACT THAT THUS THEY BAPTIZED PEOPLE BY POURING WATER ON THEM, to try to jumble and garble *that* with metaphor, is just worthy of the cause that mistates *all* authorities, misquotes all lexicons, misconstrues all facts that stand in the way of their heated distempers and fanatic intolerance. He admits Schleusner means the same, and so do we, and thus we pass in the record.

Dr. Graves quotes Barnabas, and Hermas next, thus: "Barnabas, supposed to have been the companion of St. Paul, &c.,"

and "Hermas, writing about A. D. 95, in the "Shepherd," works "ascribed" to those, say—what? Not a word about dip or immerse. But look at the dates given *these* apocryphal mythic writers. Paul's day and A. D. 95 was still in John's day. Does even Dr. Graves *believe* they lived then—the Hermas and Barnabas *here* quoted? Hear Dr. Graves, in a note on these very men, Orchard's History, p. 13, where Orchard gives A. D. 92, and Barnabas as "Paul's companion"—hear Dr. Graves on that—"I am not willing to endorse the above two fathers as orthodox or as THE COTEMPORARIES of the Apostles." All writers who have a decent respect for fact now place them far down in the second century and as most foolish and ridiculous writers and dreamers, especially Hermas. We have quoted Tertullian enough—Dr. Graves has made no attempt to reply.

He has produced his authorities. All fail. He has not—he cannot produce a case of baptism by dipping a person once into the water, or immersing him, and immersing him as Baptists baptize before the *fourth century after Christ*. He can't find a case of baptism by three immersions till Tertullian, and he dates him A. D. 204 in his last speech. Superstitions and superstitious ideas of the efficacy of water are held by Tertullian that are revolting. Yet he tells us also baptism was "a single sprinkling of water" on the subject, He uses *adspergo*—sprinkle, *perfun-do*, sprinkle, *lavo*, "wash, besprinkle," *tingo*, "moisten, wet—equivalent to Greek *hudo* and *raino*, sprinkle—sprinkle with water, and *mergo*, *mergito*—sink, plunge, for baptize. Dr. Graves renders him thus:

"Tertullian, writing about A. D. 204, says, the person to be baptized is let down into the water, and with a few words said is *dipped*."

Now let down in Tertullian is *mersus*—rendered *dip* and immerse constantly by Dr. Graves in this debate. The word he renders "dipped" is *tingo*, always used by Tertullian for baptize, even, as a rule where he uses *adspergo* and *lavo* and *mergo* to describe it. The truth is, Tertullian is here describing the superstitious way of putting a person quite neck deep—*mergo*—sinking, mersing him, and then while thus mersed in water to soak the grace of God into him—to "imbibe" it as Tertul-

lian says, the *baptism* "*tingo*" is entirely separate as an ordinance from the soaking he gets, merged in water. In many cases *if not all* at that time, the baptism was performed by sprinkling his head as he thus stood in water. At last they got to "ducking" their heads under, and *thus* began immersion—three times ducking their heads. And *these* are the allusions to *descending into* the water by the monstrously superstitious Hermas. In my possession are all the old Syriac Rituals in Assemani Bib. Orientalis, four folio volumes of Syriac—in which, in the dark, superstitious ages which Bar-Hebræus celebrates, quoted by Dr. Graves, speech sixteenth, they stood people in the water for an hour or so, parading, singing, praying over them, then baptizing them after having mersed them in water for an hour or two. But it was not the baptism. They would then baptize them "standing in the water." Hence, Gesenius Thesaurus says "*amad* among the Syrians was baptize, *because* (*quod*) they stood in the water who were baptized." Schindler says the same—"For he stood in the water." They thought *amad* in Syriac, from this way of baptizing, was the same as the Hebrew—a mistake. All ancient Syrians held that Christ stood in or by the Jordan and was baptized by pouring as He stood. Alas for immersion as the *only* mode!

I will here remark that in my debate with Dr. Wilkes, I had an edition of Wesley's notes, very old, that had not the words "by immersion" in it on Rom. vi., 5, owned now by Rev. J. R. Dempsey, Ky., but when I saw the other editions all had it, I promptly published the fact in a number of papers to do justice to all parties, as well as when my reporter made several mistakes in names—quoting Bloomfield, Olshausen and Kuinel just the reverse as I quoted them in one or two places, I was the first to detect and publish a correction. I was some 330 miles from where the work was done—proofed in enormous haste and a few such errors went uncorrected. Hence I never issued a 2d ed. myself, though Dr. Wilkes did.

Mr. President, Dr. Graves has put it in evidence that he has ransacked the U. S. for helps and facts on this proposition. No stone is left unturned by him. But all is vain. If truth

were on his side he would not have to toil, and torture, and twist as he does. He tells us we must take the first meanings, yet on Hebrew he has not taken the *first* meaning of a single lexicon of the great standards, nor the *second* as *they* explain themselves. He never takes the first meaning of *lavo*, never. He never takes the first of *louo*, nor of *amad*. Why this inconsistency. By his rule we can make sprinkle and pour always mean immerse. *Vazah* sprinkle in Hebrew is defined moistened, wet. He makes those the effect of immersion. *Hudoi* water, *raino* sprinkle—sprinkle with water he makes “bathe” that is “immerse!” *Fundo* pour means bathe also; hence *immerse*. *Perfundo* means *bathe* also, hence “immerse.” *Chuthoo* to pour, means to “bathe,” hence pour is immerse. How easy it is to prove immersion!! *Zeq* and *brecho* sprinkle, shed forth as tears, to rain, means “to bathe”—hence it is immerse. How easy it is to prove immersion.

You have seen how often he tried to put Leigh on his side. Over and again he quoted what this one, that one, another one said, as if it was Leigh. Thus all Baptist books have been doing. Yet in not an instance was it Leigh, but an immersion theologian quoted by Leigh so as to present *both* sides while he defined it as we showed for affusion. You see how he used Alford on Syriac, Castell’s lexicon; how he expressed *astonishment* that I should claim that Terretinus, Lightfoot, Alford, etc., etc., sustained affusion!! While in points almost innumerable we have exposed him, *not once*—NO, NOT ONCE has he found where we were unfair or misinterpreted an author. Truth needs no dodges or turns, or suppressions. Judge ye then, of the right.

But we now have at last his effort to meet our Hebrew argument, and *such an effort!* It simply amazes us. He takes up *tabhal* (*tabal*). Note well, and let us see the degree of accuracy he exhibits: for, dear friends, many of you, no doubt, are perplexed as to who is correct where such charges and differences occur; you want to know the truth. Now notice who is exposed and stands corrected—who not. You have already seen me correct Dr. Graves on scores of issues, and he stood corrected. *Not once have I been found incorrect and*

exposed. Look at the exposures I made in the last two speeches. They are simply fearful. It must still go on.

On *tabhal*, Dr. Graves (speech 16) says it “signifies to dip, to immerse, and is the term as generally used to express the act of putting *under*,” etc. Dr. Graves and I, are committed to this rule—that lexicons are reliable only to the extent that they are supported by the texts—the citations they give or can cite, to support their definitions. *Tabhal* occurs only sixteen times in the Bible. *In not a single instance does it put the object under any element*—submerge it. Joseph’s coat was *tabhaled*, “baptized with the blood of a kid.”—Gen. xxxvii, 31. All the facts show the garment was sprinkled with the blood. So the old Peshito translates it—*phalphael*—to sprinkle.* The Septuagint translates *tabhal* here by *moluno*. Dr. Graves says “Let it be remembered that *moluno* no more means to ‘sprinkle’ * * * than *bapto* or *baptidzo*.” Were we to grant that, it helps not his cause, if for no other reason than this—it *does* mean ‘to sprinkle!’ Passow renders it “sprinkle” *besprengen*. Rost & Palm render it sprinkle. So do Dounegan, Liddell & Scott, yea, the immersionist lexicographer, Stephanus, says of it: “*Primitiva notio est CONSPERGERE* † *the PRIMITIVE meaning is TO SPRINKLE.*” Yet Dr. Graves would tell us it does not mean to sprinkle. Examine Leviticus iv. 6, 17; xiv. 6, 49–53, where this word occurs, and you will see it does not immerse any object. The bird that was *tabhaled*—baptized “with the blood of the slain bird”—so it is in Hebrew—had not its head, wings and tail even touched with the blood. But Buxtorff, Stokius, Leigh, Schindler, Rabbi Kimchi, the nineteen renowned lexicographers in Castell, *i.e.* twenty-five of the greatest Hebrew lexicographers ever known till Furst, tell us *tabhal* when it is *dip*, “*merely touches the object to the liquid.*” [See my fourth speech, p. 87–88.] Furst defines *tabhal* “to moisten, to wet, to sprinkle, to immerse.” He is the prince of Hebrew scholars and immersed all Gentile converts.

* Buxtorff, folio lexicon, *phalphael* conspersit, Castell: conspersit Gesenius: conspersit.

† Thesaurus, vol. v. p. 6223.

But he is an honest critic, and the most studious ever known.

But to see how reliable Dr. Graves' criticisms are, he says *tabhal* means to "overwhelm." Now,

1. Not a lexicon or authority on earth ever gave it such a meaning.

2. No text on earth gives any countenance to such a meaning. Baptists are so loose in language that with them "dip," "overwhelm," "immerse," "plunge," are all one! Nor did we ever see a Baptist—certainly none of their scholars would do so—render *tabhal* "overwhelm."

He cites the washing of Naaman, II Kings, v, 10, 14, as a case of dipping, because James' translators render *tabhal* dip, in v, 14.

Benedict, the Baptist Historian, quotes the old Baptist Historian, Ivimey's Hist. Eng. Baptists, vol. 1, 138-140, thus, of the years 1616 to 1633, in England, "immersion being incontrovertibly the *universal* practice in England at that time," p. 337. [See my third speech also, p. 64.] They render it dip.

Now, 1. The command was to wash or purify himself seven times—*rachats* in Hebrew, *louo* in Greek. Lev. xiv, 7, gives us the law. "He shall sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy *seven times*, and shall pronounce him clean."

Did the Prophet *violate* God's law? This he could do and did do, standing "in the Jordan;" as truly as an army encamped *en* by the fountain, or as the 3,000,000 stood still *in* the Jordan.

2. No lexicon or authority that ever existed gives dip or immerse as a meaning of *rachats* or *louo*—wash.

3. Josephus, a high priest in Apostolic times, *interchanges* wash, *rachats*—*louo* with *sprinkle*. See page 106 of speech 5th.

The best Greek lexicons in the world give us sprinkle and pour as meanings of *louo*, including Galen, the oldest native Greek lexicographer in the world, Stephanus, and the English present edition of Liddell & Scott.

4. Not only is "shed forth," "pour," the primary force of *rachats*, But the Septuagint, so extolled by Dr Graves, trans-

lates *rachats* by *cheo*, "to pour," but never does any version render it "dip." Where now the *mode* of this washing?

5. All ancient Versions, Peshito, Itala, Vulgate, Jewish, Chaldee, Arabic, etc., render it—*tabhal* in verse 14—by *wash*—*secho* in Syriac, *rachats* in Jonathan, the Jewish translator, *louo* in Latin Versions. Hence the whole voice of antiquity, and all scholarship unite in the fact that it was not immersion.

6. In the next place, it is a physical impossibility for him to have dipped himself in the sense of dipping the whole person; for he would be fully shoulder deep or quite so, ere he could or would dip. It would only be his shoulders, arms and head he would dip therefore.

7. He was to *wash*, not dip. Such was the command. *Baptidzo* and *tabhal* mean to wash and sprinkle, and harmonize with the above, while *rachats* and *louo* never mean "dip," and hence the facts harmonize not with *dip*, here.

Dr. Graves says the "most learned Rabbins tell us that invariably in the Hebrew purifications where *rachats*, 'to wash,' is spoken of, either of the clothes or of the person, the whole body must be immersed in water." They do no such thing. No Rabbi on earth says so. Maimonides we quoted, speech 8th, p. 173-4. No mode was required. The words to express that washing were:

1. *Rachats*, primarily meaning "to pour out, to drip," and translated *pour* (*cheo*) by the Version used by the Apostles--Septuagint.

2. *Kubas*, which is "wash," and no lexicon ever made gives it "dip" or "immerse."

3. *Shataph*, "to pour," "wash," "a pouring rain," Gesenius. "A rain-gust," Furst. I Kings xxii, 38, it is used where the King's chariot is *washed*. No immersion appears in all this.

4. *Tabhal* is used, and already examined. Primarily it is "to sprinkle."

5. Maimonides and the Rabbins of the dark ages, tell us it was only for extraordinary pollutions that they thus thoroughly washed. For all ordinary washings, about one-fifth of a pint sufficed. Pocock, Leigh, Buxtorff, Lightfoot,

and Castell, all prove this from the Rabbins. Pocock took more pains on that point, among the ancient Jews, examining Maimonides' collections beyond all other scholars. Thus melts away all the positions of Dr. Graves. Try your hand again, Doctor, and don't fret so much.

Dr. Graves now quotes Mark i. 9, *eis ton Jordanen*. Does he not know it is not *eis* there? *Eis* occurs in Mark i, 5, with reference to Christ, but not in i, 9.

The Doctor says "there were two other versions made between the latter half of the first and the middle of the second century." What means this? No critic we ever heard of dates them earlier than the last half of the second century. But that is early enough for a fine version. He says of these Greek Versions—"both of these translate *taval* invariably by *bapto* and *baptidzo*." They do no such thing. Dr. Graves flouts out much about scholars, controversialists, etc. Why does he blunder so? Neither of these versions translates *tabhal* by *baptidzo*. So many blunders in one assuming so much is inexcusable.

At last he ventures, after long waiting, corresponding, and imploring, calls for help from Dr. Varden, Prof. Toy, etc. Well, he is backed by the Baptist learning of America, then, as I understand him to assume here. Very well, I'll call Prof. Austin, Bishop Tarwater, Dr. Dockery, and others into our counsel to-night, and wó to Dr. Graves then! Meantime I will pursue my argument.

We feel sorry Dr. Graves is so peevish. He says all our ado over versions is to show the extent of our familiarity with the language. We presume the Doctor is joking, however. Anyway, he will get over his wrath ere long, we hope. We know Jordan is deep water for him now, if he did quite dry it up in his first speech.

His first dash at Syriac is a repulse. He says "it has been held by a few, until recently, that Christ spoke Syriac, but the most prominent of the class, Dean Alford, frankly gives it up as untenable." Now, what will you think when we tell you this is an outrage on every principle of fact. Alford says not

one word about the Syriac in that place, being or not being Christ's vernacular. He is discussing whether Matthew composed his gospel originally in Syriac. There is not a scholar that ever lived that denied that Christ's vernacular was Syro-Aramæan or Syriac. He cannot produce a critic or even "controversialist" of *his* order that ever denied it. Here are a few of the many that will tell him so: Walton, Ludovicus, Martini, Francius, Carpzoo, Leusden, Tremeleus, Lowth, Lightfoot, A. Clarke, Horne, S. Davidson, Michælis, Stiles, President of Yale College, Alford, Olshausen, Gale, the Baptist, A. Campbell, etc., etc. Is a man not ashamed to act as Dr. Graves does in this? Dr. Graves says sprinklers have asked why was not *tava* instead of *taval* chosen to indicate immersion? He then quotes Davis on *tzeva*, another word altogether, and uses it as if the same word! He says "sprinklers ask" why "*bapto* should have been selected instead of *baptidzo* to indicate *undoubted* immersion?" (Speech sixteen.) HE NEVER HEARD, HE NEVER SAW, HE NEVER READ *anything of the kind*, and he KNOWS it. He has seen where Stuart and such as followed him, Rice, etc., say the Syrians had *tzeva*, and why not use it instead of *amad*, and the same parties *all quote baptō* to prove sprinkling. Dr. Graves knows—for he published the book—*reviewed* it—that Stuart *mainly* relied on *bapto* as found in the Greek of Daniel iv. and v., to prove sprinkling. He knows Rice *mainly* relied on *bapto* there and in the versions where the Syriac, Itala, Jerome—all ancient ones, and Origen translate *bapto* sprinkle.

Chapman, Summers, and all compiled works, follow suit. How can a man, then, knowing these things, send such a sentence to the world? You all may form an estimate from these things as to the reliability of Dr. Graves on such matters, and who is to be trusted.

Dr. Graves comes out, as I knew he would, *strongly* against the early date and purity of the grand old Peshito. He quotes Arnold as saying "the first *historic* proof of its existence is in the fourth century." But we know that Origen, the most learned man the church ever had in the first seventeen hundred years of the Christian era quotes it, and puts in historic

evidence of its being a *familiar* and well-known work in *his* day. He was born A. D. 185, only eighty-four years after John's death. Ephraim Cyrus cites one who wrote A. D. 220, who treats it as an established work in his day. Among those who held it to be of the apostolic age, we name Walton, Carpzoo, Leusden, Lowth, Martini, Tremelius, Francius, Kennicott, Michælis, and S. Davidson, Palfrey, and President Stiles, of our age. These include, by far, the ablest critics, with Castell, on Syriac, that ever have lived. A number of them wrote Syriac Lexicons and Grammars. Uhlmann and Hoffmanns may be set down in the same list—the great Syriac Grammarians of this age. To *this* we add *three* more, whom, may be, Dr. Graves will respect, viz: Drs. Gale, Judd and J. R. GRAVES, LL. D. Dr. Gale, the most learned Baptist Europe ever yet produced, thus deposes: “The Syriac must be thought *almost as valuable and authentic as the ORIGINAL ITSELF, being made from PRIMITIVE copies, in or very near the times of the apostles,*” He holds it was made from “*primitive copies*”—and he tells us what he means by a primitive copy—“*the AUTOGRAPH*” of the apostle—the very copy made by an apostle.—[Reflec. on Wall, ii, 118.]

What does Dr. Graves say, doing as so often here he does, copying another?

“The old Syriac, or Peshito, is acknowledged to be the most ancient, as well as one of the most accurate versions of the New Testament extant. It was made *at least as early as the beginning of the second century*—[*John lived into the second century*], *in the very country where the apostles lived and wrote, and where both the Syriac and the Greek were constantly used and perfectly understood.* Of course it was executed by those who understood and SPOKE [notice that] *both languages PRECISELY as the sacred writers themselves understood and spoke them.* * * * * All the Christian sects in Syria and the East make use of this version *exclusively.*—*Appendix to Stuart by Dr. Graves, p. 245.*

Thus we appeal to Dr. Graves when he and his people thought this version favored them, against the chagrined partisan and controversialist when desperate under the well-aimed arrows of truth—when stung and mortified before a people who looked for deliverance. Do not all men see that he takes any position just as he thinks it will, for the moment, aid his cause? This brings us face to face with the use of the

Syriac. But in the mean time, what does he do with all the other versions? He is so excited, he can see nothing now but the Syriac. We will expose his perversions of it speedily. But how does he dispose of our facts on all these points? He simply omits them as he did the laver and most of our facts.

When he says *tzeva* is never used to translate *baptidzo* in the Syriac, we presume he means—in the Peshito; for it often translates *baptidzo* in Syriac. He comes to the lexicons. Now does not Dr. Graves hold that *the first meaning is the primary one*? Has he not fought on that line all the way through? Then look at the facts. From his own list not a lexicon gives dip or immerse first. Bernstein is only a glossary. The great Castell gives “*amad*, PRIMARILY, to wash, to baptize. DERIVATIVELY (Aphel) to immerse,” and in no place in the New Testament does it thus occur. Yet Dr. Graves, though I loaned him my Castell for some twenty-four hours, leave out the word “primarily,” and “derivatively” as Aphel is a derived meaning and a derived form. Oberleitner puts it the same way—“derivatively, to immerse.” [See speech seventh.] Dr. Graves makes Michælis say, *amad* comes from “*ghamat*, to immerse.” I have Michælis, where that note occurs, and he *does not* say so. He suggests its possibility. He defines it exactly as Castell, not using “primarily,” but “to wash, baptize. *derivatively*, immerse.” That it is the same, even Dr. Graves puts Gutbier as saying *immerse*!! Not a word of it. It is simply baptize. Had he meant “immerse,” would he not have said “immersit,” instead of “baptizavit?” Now see from this how the Doctor forces matters against all the facts.

Dr. Graves is equally unfortunate in citations. He cites the places where the noun is applied to Siloam where people washed. Did people use Siloam as “a *swimming-pool*?” After the crushing and unanswered facts of my fifth speech on the laver, the Doctor means it as a joke when he cites Mark vii. 4 as immersion. He *will* indulge in jokes often. Well, it enlivens debate. In this however, he cites Num. xxxi, 23, rinse, wash it with water—literally “ye shall bring it to the water,” *i. e.* to be washed, and he renders this *plunge*! When did the Hebrew “go bring,” mean “immerse,” “plunge?”

And he cites Bar—Hebræus, a writer of the thirteenth century, as the language was expiring, as quoting Job xli. 1, where the Leviathan plunges in the depth of the sea. 1. That is not *dipping*. The Leviathan is already *in the depths* of the sea. He is not dipped. He is already immersed. So *amad* only washes him. Dr. Graves equally misstates Bar Ali and the rest. Bernstein's Glossary is written only on *one* Syriac writer—Bar—Hebræus of the thirteenth century. It is quoted from a second-hand authority who garbles and misquotes all who differ from him.

It has been claimed that one place is found where *amad* the Syriac word in the New Testament for baptize means to immerse, or necessarily implies it. Gotch quotes it to that purpose, and Wilkes. * “And that yet, at a small river, that same head of them should be subject to be bowed down and baptized in it.” The Syriac is “*with it*” i. e. its waters. I give Gotch's own rendering. As this is admitted to be the strongest text that Gotch, Wilkes or Graves could adduce for immersions in Syriac, let us analyze it.

1. He was baptized *not in* but “*at the river.*” † Hence it was not immersion.

2. If his *body* was *immersed*, why only speak of his *head* as baptized, or receiving its waters?

3. No one bows his head simply to be immersed—the body is placed under the element.

4. The figure of Ephraim Cyrus is, that as the waters of the sea when in billows, calmed down under the Savior's feet, so now, *his* head bows for the water of an “insignificant stream,” to be poured upon it.

5. All ancient records, pictures, and the few Syriac lexicons that thought *amad* meant *to stand*, represent that Christ *stood* while being baptized, the water being in those pictures represented as poured upon him.

In an ancient council of the Syrian church, we read that the question of the gender of the verb and the consequent form

* Bible Question, 130; Lou. Debate, 577.

† Le nahro.

to be used, was discussed, *verbs* have gender in Semitic languages—when they say: “when he baptizes, even with the invocation of the holy Trinity, and with an ablution of natural water, immersion, or *sprinkling*, it is not true baptism “unless the proper word is used also.”*

“If, when he baptizes, he uses that [form of *amad*] for the present imperative immersion in natural water, *washing* or *sprinkling*, with the invocation of the holy Trinity.”†

This is the Latin rendering of the Assemani.

Thus we see that the strongest texts they can select fail to support them, but do support us.

And now what can Dr. Graves answer to these suppressions in his quotations? Has he any respect for his own rules? None whatever. He tells us the first definition of an author is the *primary* meaning and the *only* literal, proper one. Yet he finds no lexicon on earth that gives dip or immerse as a first, second, or third meaning of *tingo*, yet he *always* renders it dip or immerse. He never saw a lexicon that gives dip, or immerse as the first meaning of *amad*, yet he puts it always to immerse.

He tells us Gotch is an Episcopalian! Does he not know that he is the President of their Baptist College at Bristol? If not, let him look at Cramp's Baptist History, p. 581. Call this Baptist an Episcopalian!

But Dr. Graves seeks to impress the people with the idea that I hold that *amad* means “to stand.” Dr. Graves, it is bad to suppress the word “primarily” in Castell, and “derivative” forms. It is bad enough to so quote as to leave all you quote in the *extremest* doubt, but *this* is *too little*. Do cheer up, hold up your head, and do better. As to Horne's views, they are nothing as compared with any one we quoted, as he is a mere servile compiler, of great value, I admit, but not an independent critic of equal merit with any of them.

As to Dr. Graves' quotation of Bar Ali, we call for the

* Bibliotheca Orientalis, Romæ, 1719 tom. iv. 250, “ablution immersione, vel *aspersione*, etc.”

† Ibid, in aquam naturalem immersio *ablutio aspersio*.

original. After suppressing so much from Castell, who is in my hand; translating Gutbier whom I have, as he does, and as no immersionist ever dared do before, dodging Michælis and mistating him as he does, we call for the papers in this case, and for the original Glossary of Bernstein, though of almost no importance, since twelve hundred years after the Apostles, is a *little late*. We call also, for the original on Hebrews vi., 2. We deny that the Syriac reads that way. Now let him give us the Syriac, then we will test it.

He quotes Bernstein's little Glossary as giving "dipped" three times. *There is no dip* in Bernstein. He does not give dip a single time. The meanings he gives are "sink, be sunk," applying it to cases of sinking in the sea, an arrow penetrating the head, &c., and the day sinking, going down. Where is the day? Who says the day dips? What jargon! But all this is in an inferior author, defining the word as it was used in *one* writer *the last representative* of Syriac as it died, twelve hundred years after its vigor had passed away. And *this* is all he can do for Syriac!! But we have more to say on this Glossary of the dark ages. It was when the Syrians and Arabs were so mixed, that Bar-Hebræus and Bernstein here confound the Arabic *ghamat* immerse, plunge in a sword, arrow, etc., with *amad*, wash. Now against all this we showed the following:

1. *Amad*. CASTELL, equivalent to twenty-one Lexicons on Syriac, gives—"Primarily, to wash, baptize. Derivatively, immerse." This is no *Bible* Syriac. It is supported by the *earliest*, golden age of the language. Graves is twelve hundred years too late.

Arabic, same word used for baptize—"To be wet with rain. To sprinkle, be sprinkled, bedew, sprinkle with water, (rain, dew.)" This is supported by citations supporting it. Native Arabs of greatest culture assisted in making it.

2. CATAFAGO, a great scholar in Arabic—lived in Arabia and Syria sixteen to eighteen years, in his Lexicon defined by him in English—"to be wet with rain." That is his *whole* definition of "*amad*." He talked and read Arabic as we do English.

3. SCHAAF gives "*wash*" as the first meaning. Its noun, he, Castell, and Oberleitner give no dip or immerse as a meaning of baptism.

4. GUTBIER does not give dip, immerse, or plunge for *amad*.

5. GESENIUS does not give dip or immerse, &c.

6. MICHÆLIS—*amad*, to wash, baptize. *Derivatively*, (Aphel) to immerse. Schaaf could find no place where it meant immerse, save Num. xxxi, 24, so of Castell. This is equivalent to *twenty-six* Syriac lexicons ALL against you.

As Dr. Graves seeks to conceal the facts under "*bathe*" where wash occurs, we will show the deception here also. Even in the case of Susanna i, 15, 17, he says it was "*bathe* or immerse one's self." Now, she called for *balls of soap* that she might "wash herself." Do we use soap in mere bathing or for *washing*?

Again, wherever the Spiritual washing is referred to—same word being used—how will it read to say, Is. i, 16, "*bathe* you?" Ps. li, "Bathe me thoroughly from mine iniquities, bathe me and I shall be clean?" But you can see what his "*bathe*" is.

He renders *hugraino*, *sprinke with water*, by "*bathe*." Liddell & Scott under *chutta*, from *cheo* pour, by "water for washing or bathing."

It was because it was poured on. The noun form of *louo* wash, which Dr. Graves renders *bathe*, is compounded with the noun of *cheo*, to pour, "a water-pourer," for the servant who poured water on those who "bathed." Also, he is called "water-sprinkler," in Greek. Yet Dr. Graves tells you *all these* "ARE IMMERSIONS!!! Liddell & Scott also render *chuthon*, a verb whose stem or root is *cheo*, by "to wash, bathe anoint;" anoint, because the oil was poured and the water was poured.

In ALL cases where *lavo*, *louo*, *nipto*, *pluno*, *rachats*, etc., are *modal*, it is either sprinkle or pour. Yet he tells you it is "*bathe* or immerse!!!" Bathed in tears is "immerse, by metaphor," so all is "immerse" with him.

Now what has he done? We both appeal to lexicons here and they crush his position. Castell and Catafago both sup-

port sprinkling downright—"wet with rain," they both give, "sprinkle, bedew," etc., etc., repeated over and again.

We appeal to texts and authorities. Dr. Graves finds *not one* that uses *amad* for immerse, though he even brought up Leviathan from the deep. We saw where *baptidzo*, Judith xii, 7, baptized *epi taes pagues*—AT the fountain of water. Guards of soldiers were set over these fountains, ch. vii, 7, etc. The Syriac reads, "*washed herself at the fountain*," Conant dishonestly rendering it immersed. Susanna *washed*. The Greek is *louo*, wash. One Syriac reads *secho*, wash. Another reads, *amad*, wash. We gave them, speech 7th. We quoted the ancient councils using sprinkle under *amad*. We cited ancient Syrian traditions about using water caught in small vessels, divided out as an element with which to baptize. All these facts stand against the vain efforts of our opponent. On *tzeva* and *Tzabeans*, the Doctor is so lame and feeble, we take pity on him, and simply refer the lover of truth to our facts, speech 7th. As to Dr. Varden's big pool "in the third century," no such pool then existed. No Baptisteries existed till in the fourth century in connection with any church. That is a well established fact. So that falls to the ground.

As to the present time, and for several centuries, all three modes have been and are practiced. The testimonies of this are too patent to need citation. The very fact that councils should say "whether by ablution, [*i. e.*, pouring], immersion or sprinkling," is sufficient there. Chapin, Dale, Chapman, Thompson, a Presbyterian tourist in the East, all give so many proofs of affusion among the Greek and Syrian churches, that quotations are useless. Our facts are of the earlier days, from the Apostles on. We care little for what mere barbarians, besotted with superstition and ignorance as the present Syrians are, as well as Greeks, say, though they practice all three modes. Apostolic practice is what we want. The whole body of early Syriac shows it was by affusion. The fact that Dr. Graves fights against the early date of the Syriac so hard, shows he knows it to be against him.

He says the Syriac of Rom. vi, 4, supports his position. Not a word of it. The Syriac tense there, is both *present*, and

preterite as the sense may determine, and *has not* the Syriac sign for preterite that is used when it wishes to express the real past tense. It is rendered *were* by Murdock who only had begun to study Syriac six months, he tells us, when he made that translation. Poor preparation was that. Better get back and render sprinkle, pour, water—sprinkle, by bathe again, Doctor.

Now with regard to the excellency and antiquity of the Peshito—

I will quote Dr. Graves sober, against Dr. Graves after rubbing up against poor Ewing so much. Dr. Graves said [Appendix to M. Stuart on Baptism, p. 245], “it was made *in the very country where the apostles lived and wrote, and WHERE BOTH THE SYRIAC AND GREEK WERE CONSTANTLY USED AND PERFECTLY UNDERSTOOD.*” He adds—quoting it from Judd, the great Baptist—“it was executed by those who understood *and SPOKE both languages PRECISELY as the sacred writers THEMSELVES understood and spoke them.*” Thus wrote Dr. Graves, a few years ago, copying Dr. Judd “by permission.” Dr. Graves, were you writing as a “controversialist” *then or now? When were you aiming at the right* of the matter? It was made in the centre of Syriac learning, as all scholars hold, and where the Syriac was pure, unmixed. Hence, being made there by the most accomplished scholars of the church, it was *universally* adopted—used by all Syrians. Paul and Thaddeus spent much of their time in the very region where it was made. Had it been made at any date later than the apostolic age, it would not have been at once *unanimously* accepted by *all the opposing sects* of the Syrian church that appear in ages immediately after the apostles. All Syria held it to be of apostolic date.

And now what is the result? Our opponent is fallen, crushed. All his dodges and charges fail. He has spent nearly a day fighting over *two* Hebrew words that I, in common with him and all writers, omitted, as we *all* always have done, till I led the way in giving texts. He has done this too in mere wrath because I exposed his suppressions and those of their church,

where the issue was—did lexicons give sprinkle, or pour?—not a question of opinion, but of fact.

Notice now—

1. All philology is with me. He never has even attempted a reply here.

2. For hundreds of years *bapto* the *primary word* whence *baptidzo* got its meaning, was to sprinkle, moisten, never dip for *five hundred years*.

3. It still meant sprinkle as well as stain, color, dye, dip in later Greek, and the world of ablest scholars—Origen, Irenæus, Hippolytus, the Syriac, Itala, Jerome, Sahidic, Æthiopic all translate it sprinkle. Not a word has he to say in reply, while he and *all* immersionists are committed to the position that it has the same meaning, though different use, as *baptidzo*.

3. Our facts showed that the primary meaning of *baptidzo* was sprinkle. For centuries it meant sprinkle, and never immerse till *Greek underwent a tremendous "change,"* as his beloved Liddell and Scott's lexicon tells us; *then*, in its *corrupt* age, it came at times to mean immerse.

4. We showed that *no lexicon on earth* gives any author as using it in this sense till Polybius, Plutarch, etc. The critics, as well as all sense, agree that, by *primary* meaning is meant, the meaning "*the inventors of the language affixed to the word.*"

5. We demonstrated that it never means *dip*, mainly proving it by the greatest immersion authors.

6. We demonstrated that it was the law of language to descend from sprinkle through all the meanings *bapto* and *baptidzo* have, but NEVER to reverse this course. This one single argument forever crushes out the whole immersion theory.

7. We demonstrated affusion from the Laver argument.

8. All versions of antiquity till the sixteenth century, made from the original, completely crush our opponent with remorseless force, and sustain us. No wonder Dr. Graves writhes. It places a Caucasas on the heart of the immersion god, whose insolence has known no bounds.

We wonder not that they writhe. But the truth shall come. You have assailed our people for years. Know then, that the days of Pompey are ended. We will conquer a peace. We have all the facts, all the means to crush out this haughty and arrogant assailant, Immersion, and we will do it.

Once more, to show you the reliability of Gotch, whom Dr. Graves almost exclusively relies on in Syriac, I quote his words. —“Of native words employed, the Syriac, Arabic, Æthiopic, etc., *all signify to immerse*.” Let the student of truth turn to my seventh speech, p 147–150, and twelfth, p 275–279. We select just one word now that in the Arabic translates *baptidzo*, *baptisma*, and *baptismos*, all in the New Testament. It is *gasala*, [see p 150].

1. No Arabic lexicon in the world renders it dip, plunge or immerse.

2. All render it wash—*lavo*. Castell gives it, “To wash, to cleanse, etc. To be sprinkled with water, to wash diligently, wash off the limbs, be sprinkled, to sprinkle! [See his Latin, p 150.] Now, what need we say more on these points? We submit the facts to a candid world with perfect confidence.—*[Time out.]*

DR. GRAVES' EIGHTEENTH SPEECH.

Replication.

MR. PRESIDENT:—Since my next speech is to be my last, and in that I must press all the proof that I am permitted to get before the people in support of this proposition, and as it is customary to give a summary of the argument, I shall now reply to my opponent for the last time on this question, and will observe as much order as it is possible in noticing a speech that is order-confounded. I have read several first-class discussions, but never have I seen a disputant so chop up his speeches, so continually repeat himself, discuss what has been said to-day awhile, and then go back to re-open issues we discussed the first day of the debate—then others, the second and third. He seems to have become dissatisfied with everything he has attempted to do, and I am not at all surprised, but only so that he should imagine that he could retrieve his “lost cause” at this late hour, and in the way he has chosen to do it, by sound and fury, by laying aside all the measures of calmness and dignity that he has heretofore observed, and descending to language and manner that would disgrace a third-rate pettifogger in a magistrate’s court.

He has dignified much of his three last speeches as “doses!” Well he knows better than any one the stomach of *his* people, for nobody else swallowed them. This audience came here to listen to a dignified discussion, and not to buffoonery.

1. You have heard his reply to what I advanced upon the true definition of *tingo*, when used by the Latin Fathers and with reference to baptism, and by the lexicographers when defining *taral*, *bapto*, *baptidzo*, and you heard the testimony of the ripest scholars of this age, that it means to dip, the act of the dyer when he dips to dye or color anything, and from this fact it came finally to mean to dye, to color, then to stain, moisten. All scholars know and admit this, and as Dr. Beecher says “No

man can [in truth] deny it." Whenever Eld. Ditzler therefore translates it by "to sprinkle," when lexicographers give *tingo*, *intingo*, *merso*, *immergo*, as the primary definition of the Hebrew verb *taval*, or the Greek verbs *bapto*, *baptidzo*, or the Syriac *amad*, he most grossly *perverts these authors*, and he does it ignorantly or intentionally, nor can he escape the alternative.

With the figurative uses of *tingo*, I have nothing to do. They belong not to this discussion. His "Fort Tingo" yields to the first shot, and all his whole argument on versions falls with it. He can get no sprinkle out of any of them without the help of *tingo* perverted to mean to sprinkle.

2. With respect to Oriental versions, besides the Syriac which I have noticed, *i. e.* the Ethiopic or Abyssinian, Amharic, Armenian Ancient and modern, Georgian, Coptic, Sahidic, Arabic, Persian, I will read from the Appendix to my edition of "Stuart, on Baptism," and for which I have condensed Mr. Judd's *able* article on versions :

ETHIOPIC OR ABYSSINIAN.—It is generally agreed that the ancient Abyssinian version in the Gheez, or dialect, appropriated to religion, should be dated as early as the introduction of Christianity into the empire, that is, rather earlier than the middle of the fourth century. This version translates *baptidzo* by *tamak*, which Castell says agrees (*convenit cum*) in signification with *tava* ; and this he defines *immersus*, *demersus*, *submersus*, *fixus*, *infixus* fuit; *to immerge*, *demerge*, *submerge*, *fix*, *infix*.

AMHARIC.—The version in the Amharic, or common dialect of Ethiopia renders *baptidzo* by the same word, *tamak*, as the ancient Ethiopic, or Gheez. The Amharic version, published by the British and Foreign Bible Society, in 1822, was made by Mr. Abraham, a learned Ethiopian, under the superintendence of M. Asselin, the French Vice Consul at Cairo.

ARMENIAN, ANCIENT.—The Ancient Armenian version is universally ascribed to Miesrob, the inventor of the Armenian alphabet, and the patriarch Isaac, at the end of the fourth, or early in the fifth century—See Horne's Introduction, vol. ii. p. 208. This version translates *baptidzo* uniformly by *mugurdel*, which is also employed in 2 Kings v. 14, where Naaman is said to have *dipped* himself in the Jordan. This word, according to Father Pascal Aucher, signifies "to baptize; to wash by plunging into water;" and it is applied to both persons and things—See Dictionary of Armenian and English, by Father Pascal Aucher, D. D. Venice, 1825. Also Dictionary of the Armenian language, by Mekitar Vartebed. Venice, 1749.

ARMENIAN, MODERN.—The modern Armenian version employs the same word as the ancient Armenian in translating "*baptidzo*," and its derivatives. The Russian Bible Society, and the British and Foreign Bible Society, have printed and circulated editions of both the ancient and modern Armenian Scriptures.

GEORGIAN.—The Georgian version, which, according to the tradition of the Greek church, was originally made in the eighth century, by Euphemius, the Georgian, and founder of the Iberian or Georgian Monastery, at Mount Athos, employs the word, *nathlistemad*, as a translation of *baptidzo*. For the meaning of this word, I have no access to the appropriate lexicons, but would refer the reader to the authority of the learned Mr. Robert Robinson, author of "The History of Baptism," who states that *all* the ancient eastern versions render the Greek word *baptidzo* in the sense of dipping.—See Rob. Hist. Bap. p. 7. London, 1790.

COPTIC.—The Coptic was the ancient dialect of Lower Egypt. During the first ages, the Christian Scriptures were read by the churches of Egypt, in the original Greek. The Coptic version has been supposed by some to have been executed in the second century. This, however, is not certain. The learned Louis Picques in Le Long, Biblioth. Sac. pars. i. p. 287, refers it to the fifth century. This version translates *baptidzo* by *tomas*. For the meaning of this word the reader is referred to the authority of Mr. Robinson, as above; and also to that of the Baptist Mission Committee, who in a recent official document addressed to the Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and relating to the subject of translations, expressly mention the Coptic as rendering *baptidzo* in the sense of *immersion*—See Annual Report of the Eng. Bap. Miss. Society, for 1844, p. 32.

SAHIDIC. The Sahidic version, or that in the dialect of Upper Egypt, appears, from the arguments adduced by Dr. Woide, to have been executed at the beginning of the second century. It is unquestionably one of the oldest versions in existence; and is esteemed of the utmost importance to the criticism of the Greek Testament. This version I have not seen. For the manner in which it renders *baptidzo*, the reader is referred to the authority of Mr. Robinson, as above.

ARABIC.—There are several Arabic versions of the New Testament, supposed to have been principally executed between the seventh and eleventh centuries, after this language had supplanted the Syriac and Egyptian. There are likewise more modern translations into this language. The Arabic versions render *baptidzo* usually by *amad*, *tzabag*, or *gatas*. "Amad," according to Schindler, "signifies the same in Arabic as in Syriac, baptizatus, in aquam immersus, tinctus, lotus fuit;" *to baptize*, *immerse into water*, *dip*, *bathe*; Castell, "ut Syr. baptizare," the same as the Syriac, *to baptize*; Schaaf, "tinxit baptizavat," *to dip*, *to baptize*. "Tzabag," according to Castell, is "tinxit panem imbuet (Isa. lxi. 4), immersit manum in aquam, baptizavit (per immersionem);" *to dip*, as bread in sauce, *t, dye*, *to immerse*, as the hand into water, *to baptize* by immersion.

"Gatas," according to Schindler, is "natavit, urinauit, mersit, submersit, immersit, sub aquam, baptizavit;" *to swim, to dye, plunge, submerge, immerse into water, baptize.*

If, therefore, these lexicographers are to be trusted, Elder Ditzler is evidently mistaken in supposing with respect to the Syrian *amad*, that the signification "to immerse," is unsupported by the analogy of kindred languages.

PERSIAN.—The Persian translations of the New Testament are all quite modern. The most ancient is the one by Simon Ibn Joseph Al Tabrizi, a Roman Catholic, made about A. D. 1341, and including only the four Gospels.—See Le Long, *Biblioth. Sacr. Pars i*, p. 269. Another version of the Gospels, by Lieut. Colonel Colebrooke, was published at Calcutta in 1804. A version of the entire New Testament in Persian was completed in 1812, by Meer Seyd Ali, under the superintendence of the late Rev Henry Martyn, which was subsequently printed at Petersburg, Calcutta and London. The Persian designates the ordinance of baptism by *shastanah*, *ghushl*, and the derivate of *amad*. The two former express *ablution*, the last has the same meaning in the Persian as in the Arabic.

TURKISH.—A Turkish version of the New Testament, by Dr. Lazarus Seaman, was published at Oxford in 1666; and in the same year a translation of the whole Bible into the Turkish language was completed by Albertus Boboosky, interpreter to the Porte. This manuscript remained at Leyden unpublished, till Dr. Pinkerton, having ascertained its value, recommended it to the British and Foreign Bible Society, at whose expense the New Testament was published in 1819. This version designates the act of baptism by the derivate of *amad*, the same word that is used in the Arabic and Persian, and expressing the same sense.

TARTAR.—The Orenberg Tartar, published a few years since by the Russian Bible Society, and which is the only Tartar version I have seen, translates the word in question by *amad*, following the Turkish and the Arabic.

HEBREW.—The first Hebrew version of the New Testament was made by Elias Hutter, and published in his Polyglot New Testament in 1599. Several versions have since appeared. Hutter's version, as well as the one by the learned Mr. Greenfield, accompanying Bagster's Polyglot, renders *baptidzo* invariably by *taval*, *to immerse*. The version executed for the London Society for meliorating the condition of the Jews, transfers the Greek word.

Ancient and Modern Western Versions.

LATIN.—Numerous translations of the Scriptures were made into the Latin language, at the first introduction of Christianity, while the Greek was yet perfectly understood, although it was being gradually supplanted as a general language. The most important of these, and the one which appears to have acquired a more extensive circulation than the rest, was

usually known by the name of the *Itala*, or old Italic, and was unquestionably executed in the early part of the second century. This version adopts the Greek word *baptidzo*. Let it be remarked, however, that the Greek, although the Latin was gradually supplanting it, was at this time understood and used as a general language over Italy, Persia, Syria, and Egypt, and indeed throughout almost the whole world.* Add to this, that the earliest ecclesiastical writers, and perhaps the very authors of this version, were of Greek origin. Under these circumstances, it cannot be thought surprising that this word should have passed from one language into the other. Its meaning, however, was as definitely settled and as well understood in Latin, as in Greek usage; and the construction that they employed shows most conclusively that it was accepted in the sense of immersion; for in some of the most important MSS. that remain of the Italic version, as the Codex Vercellensis, and Codex Veronensis, the verb in question is often, and in the last-named Codex almost invariably, construed with the accusative case. E. g. Matt. 3: 6, cod. Vercel. "et baptizabantur * * ab illo in Jordanen;" cod. Veron. "et baptizabantur * * * * * danen;" and were baptized by him into the Jordan; v. 11, cod. Veron. "baptizo vos in aquam;" I baptize you into water: v. 13, cod.

* "L'usage de la langue Grecque, qui etoit repandue chez toutes les nations, les rendit d'abord moins necessaires. On lisoit le originaux du Nouveau Testament presque dans tous les lieux du monde. Les Eveques de Rome etoient souvent Grecs d'origine, comme on le connoit aisement par leurs noms, et leur langue etoit devenue fort commune en Italie. Les Perses, les Syriens, les Egyptiens, entendoient cette langue, depuis que les Capitaines d'Alexandrie, le Grand l'avoient repandue. Origene, Clement d'Alexandrie, Denys, Theophile Cyrille, Eveques de la ville d'Alexandrie, en un mot, les grands hommes que l'Egypte produise dans les premiers siecles, ecrivoient tous en Grec. Cette langue avoit passe jusques chez les Getes et les Sarmates, quoi qu'on l'y prononcat tres durement: c'est Ovide qui nous en assure."—Basnage, Hist. de l'Eglise, 1, 9, 3.

"The common use of the Greek language which had been so generally diffused among all nations, made it a matter of little importance whether [in translating the Scriptures into the vernacular, particular words were transferred or translated]. For in almost every country throughout the world, the people were able to read the New Testament in its original tongue. The Bishops of Rome were often native-born Greeks, a fact which their names very readily attest; their native language, moreover, had very generally diffused itself throughout Italy. The Persians, the Syrians, and the Egyptians had cultivated the Greek tongue from the time of the Captains of Alexander the Great, who first introduced it. Origen, Clement of Alexandria, Denys, Theophilus and Cyril, Bishops of the City of Alexandria—in a word, those distinguished men that Egypt produced in the first centuries—all wrote in Greek. This language had reached, even as far as the "Getes" and the Sarmatians who, it is said, pronounced it very harshly: it is from Ovid that we learn this fact."—Basnage, *Hist. of the Church*, 1-9-3.

Veron. "Tunc venit Jesus a Galilæa ad Johannem ut baptizaretur ab eo in Jordanen;" *then came Jesus from Galilee to John, that he might be baptized by him into the Jordan.* Compare also John i, 26, and Mark i, 5. See Evangeliarum Quadruplex, ed J. Blanchini, Rome, 1749. Nor can it have escaped the notice of the intelligent reader, that the Latin Fathers were accustomed to use *baptidzo* synonymously with *mergo*, *tingo*, etc. Thus Tertullian, De Bap. c. 10, quoting Matt. 3: 11, represents John as saying that he dipped [*tinguere*] the people unto repentance, but that one should come after him, who would dip [*tingueret*] them in the Spirit and fire. Now Tertullian, in quoting the Evangelist's words, could not have substituted *tingo* for *baptidzo*, unless the two words had been synonymous. Indeed, Prof. Stuart, p. 362, acknowledges that the Latin as well as the Greek fathers, plainly construed *baptidzo* in the sense of immersion. It appears, then, that the early Latin translators and ecclesiastical writers adopted this word, because it was already in familiar use, and was as universally understood to signify immersion among the Romans, as among the Greeks. The Latin versions, therefore, are as decisive for immersion, as are the Oriental ones. And, although the Greek language gradually fell into disuse among the Romans, this word having been once adopted, was, as a natural consequence, perpetuated by the general use of the Latin Scriptures, and their necessary influence upon the choice of ecclesiastical terms, till at length it came to be used to the almost entire exclusion of the equivalent vernacular expressions. Almost all the Latin interpreters, whether Catholic or Protestant, have followed the earlier translators in the adoption of the Greek word. Some of the most recent and best, however, translate *baptidzo* by an appropriate Latin term. Jaspis, an eminent German scholar and critic, in his version of the epistles, renders it either by *immergo*, *to immerse*, *tingo*, *to dip*, or some equivalent expression. Prof. H. A. Schott, in his critical edition of the Greek Testament, accompanied with a Latin translation, renders the word in all cases by *immergo*, whether relating to the Christian rite or not.

From these facts, we are authorized to translate *baptizare*, whenever it is used by a lexicographer as the signification of *baptidzo* or *amad*, by *to immerse* or *to dip*.

GOthic.—The Gothic version was made from the Greek, about the middle of the fourth century, by Ulphilas, a celebrated bishop of the Mœsogoths. As the author was educated among the Greeks, he was undoubtedly fully competent to his task. Unfortunately, however, this important version has not come down to us entire. Only a mutilated copy of the four gospels, and some fragments of the epistle to the Romans, remain. This version, as far as appears, renders *baptidzo* in all cases by *daupyan*, *to dip*. Cases not relating to the Christian rite exhibit the same principle. Thus, Mark. vii, 4 is rendered, "And when they came from the market, *ni daupyad*, *unless they dip*, they eat not; and many other things there be, which they have received to hold, as *daupeinins*, *the dippings of cups*, and pots, and brazen vessels, and couches."

GERMAN.—A German translation from the Latin Vulgate, by an author now unknown, was first printed in 1466, and underwent several subsequent impressions before the appearance of Luther's inestimable and much-admired translation, which was published in detached portions at various intervals, from 1522 to 1532. The Catholic versions by Detemberger and Emser appeared soon after that of Luther, and in 1630, that by Caspar Ulenburg. All these versions translate *baptidzo* by *taufen*, a dialectical variation of the Gothic *daupyan*, and signifying to immerse. Luther says: "The Germans call baptism, *tauff*, from depth, which in their language they call *tieff*; as it is proper that those who are baptized be deeply immersed."* The author of the "Glossarium Universale Hebraicum," referred to above, represents the Ger. *taufen* as corresponding in form and signification with the Sax. *dippan*, Eng. *dip*, etc. Gesenius, as already quoted above, classes it with the Goth. *doufan* [daupyan], Ital. *tuffare*, and other words signifying to dip,—and which he considers as identical in regard to form with the Heb. *tava*, *to d p*, *to immerse*. Dr. Knapp, Professor of Theology at the University of Halle, speaking of the meaning of the word *baptism*, says: "*To baptisma* from *baptizein*, which properly signifies *to immerse*, (like the German *taufen*) *to dip in*, *to wash* by immersion." In another place he says: "It would have been better to have adhered generally to the ancient practice, as even Luther and Calvin allowed." See Knapp's Theology, translated by L. Woods, Jr., vol. 2, pp. 510, 517.

GERMAN-SWISS.—The version in the German-Swiss, or Helvetic dialect, originally made by John Piscator, between the years 1602 and 1604, and subsequently revised by several divinity professors and pastors of the Helvetic churches, translates *baptidzo* by *taufen*. The version by Jo. Henr. Reizius, first published in 1703, uses *taufen* in cases relating to the Christian rite, explaining it in the margin by *eintauchen*, the common word for immersion. In Mark vii, 4, it translates *baptidzo* by *eintauchen*, to immerse, and the noun *baptismos* by *eintauchung*, *immersion*; and so in Luke xi, 38. In Heb. vi, 2 and ix, 10, *baptismos* is translated by *tauffe* in all the versions I have seen.

JEWISH-GERMAN.—The Jewish-German translation published a few years ago by the London Society for promoting Christianity among the Jews, likewise uses *stauffen* in translating *baptidzo*.

LOWER SAXON.—The Lower Saxon translates the word in question by *taufen*. This version was executed under the direction of John Bugenhagen, and, according to Le Long, was printed in 1524-30; but according to

* "Primo, nomen Baptismus Græcum est: Latine potent verti *mersio*, cum immergimus aliquid in aquam, ut totum tegatur aqua; et quamvis ille mos jam absolaverit apud plerosque (neque enim, totos demergunt pueros, sed tantum, paucula aqua perfundunt) debebant tamen prorsus immergi, et statim retrahi. Id enim etymologia nominis postulare videtur. Et Germani quoque baptismum, *tauff* vocant, a profunditate, quam *tieff* illi sua lingua vocant, quod profunde demergi conveniat eos qui baptizantur." Works, vol. i, p. 336. Jena, 1556.

Horne, 1533-4. See Le Long Biblioth. Sac. P. ii, p. 247. Horne. Int. vol. ii, p. 229.

BELGIAN.—A Belgian or Flemish translation made from the Latin vulgate, was printed in 1475. Another was executed from Luther's German version, for the use of the Protestants, in 1560. A new translation however, was executed from the original, by order of the Synod of Dort, and printed in 1637. This translation has been much admired for its fidelity. The Belgian versions translate *baptidzo* by *doopen*, which is a dialectical form of the word *taufen*, and signifies *to dip*.

DANISH.—The earliest Danish version was made from the Latin vulgate. The next was executed from Luther's German version, by command of Christian III, king of Denmark, and printed in 1550. It was subsequently revised and corrected by order of Frederic II, in 1589. The version in present use was made from the original Greek, by John Paul Resenius, and at the command of Christian IV. It was first published in 1605-7. See Le Long, Pars. ii, pp. 287, 288. Horne, vol. ii, p. 229. The Danish translates *baptidzo* by *dobe*, which is a dialectical form of the Goth. *daupyan* and the German *taufen*, and signifies *to dip*.

SWEDISH.—The Swedish version was originally made from Luther's German translation, and printed at Upsal in 1541, by the command of Gustavus I, king of Sweden. This was afterwards revised and conformed to the original text in 1703, by the command of Charles XII. See Le Long, Pars. ii, p. 296. Horne, vol. ii, p. 230. The Swedish renders *baptidzo* by *dopa*, a dialectical variation of *lobe*, and signifying *to dip*.

WELSH.—The Welsh translation of the New Testament was originally made by order of Parliament, and first published in 1567. This was revised and corrected by Wm. Morgan, bishop of Llandaff, in 1588. During the reign of James I, the Welsh version underwent a further examination and correction by Dr. Parry. This corrected version, which was published in 1620, is the basis of all subsequent editions. See Horne, vol. ii, pp. 258, 259. The Welsh translates *baptidzo* by *bedyddio*, *to immerse*. For the original derivation and meaning of this word, the reader is referred to the authority of Edward Lhuyd, A. M., a learned Welshman, and a very distinguished antiquarian, in his *Archæologia Britannica*, under the word *Baptisma*. The following is the substance of his remarks: "*Bedydd*, the Welsh word for baptism, is derived from *suddiant*, a British word which is well known to signify dipping, or immersion; and the verb of which is *soddi* or *suddo*. The word for baptism in the Cornn-British dialect, is *bedzhidhian* (*bedsuddian*), the affinity of which, with the Welsh word *suddiant*, must be obvious to every one. This Cornn-British word *bedsuddian*, points out the origin of the Armorican word for baptism, *badudhiant*, (*badudhiant*), which is doubtless no other than *badusultiant*, whose correspondence or synonymy with the Welsh word *suddiant* is equally clear and certain with that of the aforementioned Cornn-British word. By a comparison of these Armorican and Cornn-British words, we are led unavoidably to conclude that *bedsuddiant*, or *badusuddiant*, must have been the original word for baptism in the British language, and that

from which the present Welsh word *bedydd* sprung. In time, this ancient British word, like many others in all languages, underwent some change by abridgment or contraction. It was originally *bedsuddiant* or *badsuddiant*; and whatever may be said as to the precise meaning of the prefix, the word itself unquestionably signified immersion; for the word *suddiant* has always amounted to that as fully as any word in any language could possibly do." See Article *Baptisma*, in Lhuyd's Arch. Brit. Comp. Vocab. ed. 1707; or a translation of the same, in Dr. Richard's answer to Rev. B. Evans on Baptism, pp. 16, 17, ed. 1791.

SLAVONIAN.—The Slavonian or old Russian translation of the New Testament was made from the original Greek in the ninth century, by the two brothers Cyril and Methodius. It was first printed in 1570. The Russians, being a branch of the Greek church, practice immersion in all ordinary cases; but the ceremony of making the sign of the cross upon the candidate in connection with immersion, had come to be regarded in the time of Cyril and Methodius, as the more important ceremony of the two, and absolutely essential to the ordinance. Hence, among the Russians this rite is technically designated from the "crossing," and not from the "immersion." Their version therefore, does not in fact translate *baptidzo* at all; but substitutes the term *krestit*, to cross; as Matt. iii. 5, 6, "Then went out to him Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were crossed by him in Jordan, confessing their sins," v. 11. etc. "I indeed cross you," etc. This is greatly to be regretted; for such a technical designation of the rite banishes entirely from view the ordinance of Jesus Christ, and substitutes in its place a tradition of men; and every version constructed upon this principle, though not in the least degree hostile to immersion, not only sanctions, but is calculated to perpetuate a piece of gross superstition and folly, that had its birth among the early corruptions of the man of sin. [This meaning of *krestit* is stated upon the authority of a Russian gentleman, whose education and rank are a sufficient guaranty for its correctness.]

RUSSIAN.—As the Slavonic is no longer understood among the common people, a translation of the Scriptures into modern Russ was made by M. Gluck, a Livonian clergyman, and printed at Amsterdam in 1698. As the Russian language has undergone considerable changes since that time, the Emperor Alexander in 1816, directed the Synod of Moscow to prepare a new translation. The New Testament was accordingly completed in 1822. See Horne, vol. ii, p. 266. The modern Russian employs *krestit*, in the same manner as the Slavonic. Several other nations in northern and eastern Europe, which are related to Russia either by language or religion, appear to have constructed their translations upon a similar principle.

3. Eld Ditzler goes back again to the Syriac. He says nothing that I need reply to. I refer all to my treatment of the subject in a former speech.

The Syrians always, from the first, immersed, and their de-

scendants do still immerse as do all the Oriental Christians and this settles the whole matter. The words they applied to the act, must mean the act they performed, unless, as with the Germans a change of the rite can be proved.

4. He returns to *taval* (Hebrew) again, and makes Schindler, and Stokius, and Leigh, say that *taval* means primarily "to moisten," when they give *tinxit, intinxit immersit* "to dip," "to dip in," "to immerse," as its real physical sense, and Faustianus, whom Dr. Beecher quotes as undoubtedly using *tingere* in the sense of "to dip," my opponent makes him say "to sprinkle!" I only mention this to express my—I cannot say astonishment, after my knowledge of his treatment of Schleusner and Stokius, for I can no longer be astonished at what he is capable of doing—indignation at such palpable perversion, accepted as learning by his people who do not know the language.

5. This rehash of Furst's philological fancies is simple nonsense. This is not the place to discuss the question, what is the true root of *taval*, *tab*, or *bal*? For lack of better material, he entertained you with a controversy between Gesenius and Furst! It is simply an insult to your understandings, and I pass it. Whether the root of *taval* be *tab*, or *bal*, the verb was never used by the Jews in any other sense than "to dip," "to immerse," to cover all over, and so with *baptidzo*, whatever its root, it never did mean in the Greek language anything else than "to dip," "to immerse," to cover all over, and Eld. Ditzler has never given us the shadow of proof, or authority, save his bare word, that it ever did.

6. I can only regret the persistency with which my opponent misstates me. He compels me to be very plain and severe. I reaffirm with emphasis that I have given the testimony of forty lexicons, among them all that are considered upon either continent standard authorities, and every one gives "to dip," "to immerse," as the only primary and real signification of *baptidzo*, and I therefore affirm that this is its only real meaning. I again reaffirm that the figurative are not the real meanings of the verb. It is not true, though an angel from heaven should assert it, that "all the great standards give to sprinkle or pour," as a

literal meaning of *baptidzo*. Nor is it true that *one* Standard Greek Lexicon gives "to sprinkle," or "to pour," as a real literal meaning? Let my opponent produce one, let him produce any author who declares he has ever seen one. I say let him now here before you, and before this proposition, bring it forward or no longer repeat the misstatement. If he fails to do so, he virtually confesses he has stated what he nor any other man is able to prove. Baptists are justified in saying with Dr. Carson, with Anthon and Stuart, that no Greek Lexicon on earth gives any other meaning than "to immerse," or its equivalent, as the literal, real signification of *baptidzo*.

7. Beza, a Presbyterian, and the first scholar of his age, and successor of Calvin, and whom Eld. Ditzler never mentions but to misrepresent, says emphatically, "Christ commanded us to be *baptized*; by which word it is certain immersion is signified." Neither does the word *baptidzo* signify to wash except by consequence, for it properly signifies to plunge into, for the sake of "coloring" or "dyeing." When he makes you believe that Beza teaches that *baptidzo* means "to sprinkle, never "to immerse," in the New Testament, he treats Beza as he does Schleusner, and his other authors. I refer all to my argument from the admissions of eminent Pedobaptist authors, for what Witsius, Turrentin, Vossius, Suicer, really do say.

8. My opponent makes another lame attempt to defend his treatment of Schleusner, but still the stern fact stands to convict him of the bald, palpable perversion of an author, that is unprecedented in the annals of controversy. He says that I, forsooth, in the year 1868 left out the very words he suppressed. It is true I did, *but I did not put a palpable falsehood into the lips of the author*. I did in no sense misrepresent Schleusner's primary definition of *baptidzo* nor its use in the New Testament, but Eld. Ditzler makes him say that in the sense of "to dip," "to immerse," *it is never used in the New Testament*, AND SCHLEUSNER DOES NOT SAY THIS. This is the single issue, and this I have *proved*. No scholar can or ever will question it.

Eld. Ditzler, to make his author testify against Baptists, actually SUPPRESSES A PART OF A SENTENCE, where the unfinished

part is a reference to another verb. Sometimes translated by *baptidzo*, having another sense than *taval* generally has in which sense this latter, *baptidzo*, is never used in the New Testament—says Schleusner—but Elder Ditzler, by suppressing this part of the sentence makes him say in the sense of *taval* to immerse it is never used in the New Testament!!

I know that this must be settled by scholars; those acquainted with Greek and Latin. And so confident am I that no scholar can, or ever will question the construction I have given, that I am willing for it to go to the record. Schleusner never did say what Eld. Ditzler makes him say, that *baptidzo*, in its primary sense of to dip, to immerse, is never used in the New Testament, but he did say, that in the sense that *tava* is used in the passages referred to—to drown, to sink down so as to perish, it is never used in the New Testament.

By a statement in his last speech, Eld. Ditzler has clearly discovered his real ignorance of the notation of the Psalms alluded to by Schleusner. He says: “Now it so happens that in Psalm ix. 6 *James’* ‘*destructions*’ are named as coming on the people.” The place in our version where this *tabha* occurs is Psalm ix. 15! Now, I have had nothing to do with his Psalm ix. 6, nor ix. 15, NOR ARE THESE THE PASSAGES SCHLEUSNER REFERS TO; and Eld. Ditzler, it appears, knows no better!! Every scholar knows that the notation of the Psalms in the Hebrew and Septuagint do not correspond with our English version, and it would have been well for Eld. Ditzler to have sought some information on that subject before talking about my blundering into a ditch. In the Hebrew, the motto of the chapter is recited for the first verse. Hence Psalm ix. 6 quoted by Schleusner is ix. 7, which my opponent, not knowing, of course has not examined, but he tells you he finds “destructions” in the sixth verse, and declares that I look at that as *tabha*!! Who is in the ditch here? In the other Psalm quoted as lxviii. 5 in Schleusner, it should be lxix. 2 to correspond with our version and the Hebrew. The tenth and eleventh Psalms were united in the Septuagint so that Psalm xii. became xi., etc., and thus Psalm lxix. of Septuagint is

Psalm lxviii. of our version. The figure 5 in Schleusner is evidently a misprint, for 3, and 3 of the Hebrew corresponds to verse 2 of our version. *Tabahte* is the Hebrew word in this verse, which signifies *to sink deep*. The verb at the close of the verse translated overflow, means to sweep away as with a flood of rushing water. Here is a sense in which Schleusner wishes to say that *baptidzo* is never used in the New Testament.

So of Psalm ix. 6 (Heb. 7) the Hebrew word translated by *baptidzo* in the gloss of the unknown writer is derived from *shuha* which signifies to settle down—as Proverbs ii. 18, her house sinks down *shuhah into death* (el maveth). In *this sense* the great Schleusner wishes to say and *does* say in his lexicon that *baptidzo* is never used in the New Testament, but Eld. Ditzler, by suppressing an important and explanatory part of a sentence forces him to say, that in its proper signification, of to dip, to immerse—answering to *taval* in 2 Kings v. 14, where Naaman dipped himself in the Jordan—it is never used in the New Testament! Let these facts go to the record and be decided by the verdict of impartial scholarship with the facts respecting Stokius.

Touching Hermas and Barnabas. They are placed in the First Century by standard writers who refer to them. I have no time to discuss the matter. I referred to their testimony, touching the act of baptism in their day, whether they lived in the First or, as Eld. Ditzler claims, in the Second Century. Though their style is highly metaphorical, yet no man can impeach their testimony as to the *act* of Christian baptism—it was by immersion only, in their day.

As the Elder is so hard upon Hermas because of this testimony, and upon me for introducing them as belonging to the First Century, I will inform him what his own church teaches about them and when they lived. I read from *Ruter's Church History*, published by the M. E. Church, who places them in the First Century, and says :

“The Pastor of Hermas is generally allowed to be genuine, and it is also probable that it was the work of that Hermas who is spoken of by St. Paul, though some have ascribed it to a certain Hermas, or Hermes, brother to Pius bishop of Rome, who lived in the succeeding century.

The work is entirely allegorical, consisting of visions and similitudes. Like all works of this nature, it is extremely unequal as a composition, and I confess but little satisfactory to my judgment. It was however in high estimation in the early ages, and is spoken of as Scripture both by Irenæus and Tertullian."³—Ruter's *His. of the Church*, p. 39.

It is no matter what my own private opinion may be, this is what his, Eld. Ditzler's, church holds and teaches, and what it is *his* duty to believe.

Should I attempt to reply to his description of baptism in Tertullian's day, I feel that I should insult the good sense of this audience. Any one who can believe what he says about it—well, I will say there is nothing too monstrous or absurd for the faith of such an one. Never have I seen the manifestations of such recklessness of statement as my opponent is exhibiting as this proposition is drawing to a close.

It has been brought to light that Methodists have a spurious edition of Wesley's Notes on the Gospel, which they circulate extensively, in which Wesley is served as Eld. Ditzler serves Schleusner, a *part of a sentence* being suppressed, and according to the statement of Eld. Ditzler, he never saw a correct edition of Wesley's Notes until his debate with Mr. Wilkes! Rev. J. R. Dempsey, Ky., (why did he not give the P. O.?) should produce that spurious edition, and let the world know who got it up, if his church by her Book Concerns did not, let us know who did. I call for the book.

13. He still insists that Leigh defines *baptidzo* to mean to sprinkle. I can only refer you to his testimony given under lexical authorities—that's the unvarnished testimony of Leigh whatever Eld. Ditzler may say.

14. My opponent says that "in points almost innumerable he has exposed me"—*i. e.* misquoting and misstating authors.

Mr. President, the rules by which we are governed, forbid my replying to this statement as it deserves. I will content myself with this—when my accuser rises again let him specify just one instance, or let his silence convict him of stating what he knows to be false. I challenge him to point out one instance where I have misquoted, mistranslated or misrepresented

³ De Pud. 10.

an author in this discussion. I am determined these statements to my detriment shall not go upon the printed page unchallenged—harsh as it may appear in me. He says whenever he has corrected me, I have stood corrected—let all see who will stand corrected now—stand self-corrected by his own silence.

Elder Ditzler makes a square issue with me before you, touching the proper signification of the Heb. verb *taval*, for you see he is back again upon *taval*; he don't say all he has to say when he is on a subject, and then leave it, but he flies back and forth to it like a weaver's shuttle.

He says "*taval* occurs sixteen times, [a mistake of one,] in the Bible and not in a single instance does it put the object under any element." Now it happens that everyone can decide between us on this issue—to the law and the testimony.

1. Lev. iv, 6, and the priest shall dip, *taval*, his finger in the blood," while the finger was in the blood was it under or within any element? I think a child can answer.

2. Lev. xiv, 6, "and shall dip, *taval*, the living bird in the blood of the bird that was killed over running water etc."

Eld. Ditzler presumes to say that the bird God commanded to be dipped in this blood and water, "had not its head, wings and tail even *touched* with the blood"!! Who told him so? Buxtorff, Stokius, Leigh, Schindler and every lexicon of the Hebrew language tells him that the literal and true meaning of *taval* is to dip, to dip in, immerse. If Moses obeyed the command he did dip the *entire bird* into the blood of its slain fellow mixed with water, and every Jewish commentator declares that nothing less than an entire dipping would meet the requirements of the law and that it was accustomed to be done. The Misuah says that the very wings to the extreme tips and the tail were to be so bound as to be dipped into the blood and water. *

So much for his statement of a plain fact. Then let the devout Christian consider the requirements of the type. It required two birds to represent the work of Christ as two goats

* Ebr. Concord, part p. 64 No. 318.

were requisite preparatory to the day of atonement to typify Christ as the sanctifier and Sin-bearer of his people. One goat was burned without the camp to typify the satisfaction that Christ was to make to the divine law for sin, and the scape-goat, on which the sins of the people were laid, was sent away into the wilderness to signify that Christ was their Sin-bearer, to bear away their sins from them forever.

So was the slain bird a type of Christ, and of his shed blood and the *living* bird dipped in blood and water was a type of Christ bathed in his own blood and sufferings—not a few drops slightly touching some parts of him, but a complete immersion, an overwhelming in them. Christ compared his sufferings and death to a baptism—literally *immersion*, when he said “I have an *immersion* to undergo and how am I straightened until it be accomplished, Luke xii, 50. The living bird must have been wholly immersed in the blood and water, to have been a type of Christ suffering in his whole nature, body and soul, that he might when released, bear our sins away from us as far as the east is from the west.” To say there was no more than an eggshell full of the water and blood, is simply irreverent—there must have been sufficient spring-water taken in the vessel for the immersion of the entire living bird with the cedar wood and hyssop, or the command could not have been obeyed, nor the rite have been a type of Christ.

3. The third instance is in the 51st. verse of same chapter, and refers to the same ceremony—the living bird was certainly by the verb *taval* put under, or within the element.

4. “The fourth place where *taval* is used is in Num., xix, 18: “And the clean person shall take hyssop and dip it into the water.” Had the Jews taken *water* and sprinkled it *upon* the bunch of hyssop, they would have violated the law. There was an immersion here.

5. The fifth instance is in Ruth., ii, 14: “And Boaz said unto her at meal time, come thou hither and eat of the bread and dip thy morsel in the vinegar.” Adam Clark admits the act to have been an immersion. He says: “*Vinegar*,” a kind of acid sauce used by the reapers to dip their bread in, which

both cooled and refreshed them.” They dipped that they might *soak* their bread in the sauce.

6. The sixth instance is in Ex. xii, 22. “And ye shall take a bunch of hyssop and dip it into the blood.” The bunch, or head of the hyssop bough was dipped into the blood, not the blood sprinkled upon it.

7. The seventh occurrence of *taval* is in Deut. xxxiii, 24. “And let him dip his *foot* in oil.” Here the foot of Asher was to be immersed in, not simply touched, moistened with—oil, indicating abundance, the latter act would have indicated scarcity.

8. The next instance is in Ezek. xxiii, 15: “Exceeding in *dyled* attire.” Here King James’ translators have rendered *taval* by dyed—the effect for the cause—while the Holy Spirit says *dipped* attire, which indicates that their attire had been dipped in order to color it.

9. The ninth instance is found in Job, ix, 31: “Yet shalt thou *plunge* me in the ditch.” As a thorough defilement is indicated here, he must have been wholly covered with the filth of the ditch.

10. The next occurrence of *taval* is Lev. ix, 9: “And he dipped his finger *in* the blood.” The *finger* here, not the hand or body, must have been introduced *into the element blood*, which was an immersion of the part named.

11. The next we meet with is in 1 Sam., ix, 27: “And he [Jonathan] put forth the end of his rod, that was in his hands, and dipped it in the honeycomb.” He did not dip the whole rod, but the *end* of it, and was not the end introduced within the element, honey?

12. 2 Kings, v, 14: “Then went he [Naaman] down and dipped himself seven times in Jordan.”

Eld. Ditzler now declares that the prophet violated God’s law for the purification of leprosy if he commanded Naaman to dip in the Jordan “!” that the law was “He shall sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed from leprosy seven times, and shall pronounce him clean.” He assumes then that the prophet commanded him to go and *sprinkle himself* seven times

into the Jordan! and that Naaman did so, but never dipped himself into its waters once! I will say that I have met with temerity and recklessness in disputants before, but never with the equal of this! Let his be the glory or the *shame* of being the first man, known to me, who ever denied, with the inspired record staring him in the face, that could not, in Hebrew or Greek, more clearly express the act of immersion—that Naaman went down and dipped himself in the waters of the river Jordan! I refer all to what I said in my sixteenth speech on this case, and I have nothing to modify. I pass this case, calling your attention to a discussion of an authority infallible with my opponent. In his debate with Mr. Wilkes, when considering the case of Judith, Eld. Ditzler declared that the force of the Greek forbade the idea of immersion in the case, since the text was “*epi tes peges*” at the fountain. Mark his words, “were it immerse, it would at least be, *eis ten pegen*, accusative case with *eis* into, not *epi* at,” p. 483.

Now in the case of Naaman the Greek text is precisely as he says it should be to indicate an immersion. “*Ebaptizeto eis ton Jordanen*,” and now he scouts the idea of an immersion in the passage!

But he offers an issue and I meet it squarely—i. e., *that by sprinkling alone the purification of leprosy could be consummated.*

To make out his case, he treats God's word as he does Schleusner, *gives but part of the law!* He gives only the 7th verse of Lev. xiv. Now read the 8th:

“And he that is to be cleansed, shall *wash himself in water*, that he may be clean; and after that he shall come into the camp, and shall tarry abroad out of his tent seven days. But it shall be on the seventh day that he shall shave all his hair off his head and his beard, and his eyebrows, even all his hair shall be shorn off; and he shall wash his clothes, also he shall wash his flesh in water, and he shall be clean.”

Does this look as if a simple sprinkling of himself seven times with water, was all the law required? Is a part of the truth the truth? Is not, in the language of law, *suppressio veri, suggestio falsi?*

I have quoted Dr. Alting, Dr. Meyer, Kitto and Maimonides, to show that wherever *rachats* was used to denote the washing of the person, or the “flesh” of a person, that it in-

licated an entire immersion, and that in the law, where the clothes were required to be washed, it called for an immersion, not only of the clothes, but of the body of the person, to complete the cleansing. The prophet commanded him to bathe himself seven times, and the Hebrew text says he *tavalized*, dipped; and the Greek text says he *baptized*, immersed himself; but Eld. Ditzler declares in the face of both, and of all authorities, that he only *sprinkled* himself! It is useless to reason. Then he says that "it is [was] a physical impossibility for him to have dipped himself—in the sense of dipping the whole person; for he would be fully shoulder deep, or quite so, ere he could or would dip!"

I will not answer him according to his folly—but ask him for the sake of others—for his brethren are chargeable with the same puerility all over our land, when God commanded the priests to dip their feet in the Jordan, was it a physical impossibility? Did they not dip them by stepping into the water until they were covered by it? Then Naaman dipped the lower part of his body by wading into the river and the rest of it by immersing it under the water.

I have, I fear, only dignified his objections by noticing them. Let us look at the remaining places where *taval* occurs.

13. Second Kings viii. 15. "He took a thick cloth and dipped it in water and spread it on his face so that he died." A child would not question that the cloth was indeed dipped into the water, and before it was taken out, it certainly was within the element.

14. Gen. xxxvii. 31. "And they took Joseph's coat and killed a kid and dipped the coat in the blood." The Greek version says, dyed it, but dyeing is the *effect* of the dipping.

15. Josh. iii. 15. "The feet of the priests that bore the ark were dipped in the brim of the Jordan." Were not their feet within the element water, in this case? If there is another instance it does not now occur to me.

Now against his position I submit these fifteen cases, in every one of which a clear instance of immersion is indicated, that you may decide from them what reliance you can place upon his

assertion that "*in not a single instance does "taval" put the object under any element."*

You have just heard Eld. Ditzler assert that the three million Israelites stood still in Jordan! To show you with what accuracy he reads the word of God, for it would be in violation of courteous debate to charge him with an *intentional* perversion of it—I will read the whole passage in which the expression is found.

"And thou shalt command the *priests* that bear the ark of the Covenant [four of them] saying. When ye are come to the brink of the water of Jordan, ye shall stand still in Jordan." Josh. iii. 8.

In verse 17 any one can see how the priests obeyed.

Now, if Eld. Ditzler thus unblushingly perverts the word of the God of heaven and earth, what are you not warranted to believe he will do with the productions of men? It is in this way he has treated his lexicons and authorities, so that I have been forced all along into constant impeachments of his honor and fair dealing. He scarcely speaks five minutes without being guilty of this very thing. Why, sir, in the next breath after saying that the thirty thousand stood still in Jordan, he tells you emphatically that "*eis ton Jordanen* does not occur in Mark i. 9 as I say it does but in verse 5!" Must I let this pass unnoticed, and so stand convicted of error?—for not one in one thousand who read our debate will turn to look for themselves, but will take his word. He tells you that I have stated what was not so when I stated that *eis ton Jordanen*, occurs in Mark i. 9.

Now, Mr. President, what must you think when I tell you that the phrase *eis ton Jordanen* OCCURS NOWHERE ELSE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, EXCEPT WHERE I SAID IT DOES IN MARK i. 9!! Let every Greek scholar pause and examine for himself. The motive that could induce Eld. Ditzler to deliberately make such statements, I cannot conceive. I will not here charge him with *mistaking* as to a matter of fact, for he could not mistake it, but I do charge him with boldly *misstating a plain matter of fact*.

My time does not permit me to notice and expose many other similar statements—the scores of similar statements—that

marked the rest of his speech, by which he seeks to break the force of my argument and put me in a false light. I must trust the rest to the record, knowing that the fairminded reader will examine what I have said, and not my opponent's representation of my position and statements.

Eld. Ditzler asks with great emphasis if I do not know that Dr. Gotch is the President of Bristol College, England, as though this was proof of a misstatement, when I said he was an Episcopalian. It is only a proof of the statement of Dr. Stock of England, that our brethren over there were filling their colleges with Pedobaptists to the great detriment of the denomination. Dr. Gotch is an Episcopalian, nevertheless, unless he has changed his views lately.

He sees fit, for present effect I suppose, to flatly contradict my statement that according to the Jewish Rabbins, where *rachats* is used with reference to washing the *flesh* or the *clothes*, the immersion of the whole body is meant. Well, so distinguished a scholar as Dr. J. Alting (Presbyterian), says: "The verb *rathatz* or (*rachats*), he washes, is frequently used either alone or with the addition of the word *flesh*, and the whole *flesh*, which is baptism, * * * * whence the Jews observe that whenever a command occurs for washing the *clothes*, the washing of the whole body is either added or understood."—*Opera*, Tom. iv. com. in *Epis. ad. Heb.* p. 220.

He declares to you that "*no Rabbi on earth says so.*" Was not Maimonides a Rabbi? Davenport says of him,—“one of the most celebrated of the Jewish Rabbis who is called the ‘eagle of the doctors’ and ‘the lamp of Israel,’ was profoundly versed in languages and in all the learning of the age.” Is he not competent to testify, and will the simple word of my opponent suffice to impeach him? What does he say? “Wherever washing of the *flesh* and washing of the *clothes* are mentioned in the law, nothing else is meant but the dipping of the whole body in a confluence of water; and that if he dip his whole body except the tip of his little finger, he is still in his uncleanness etc.” “No mode is required” says my learned friend! There is *nothing but mode required*—a dipping of the whole body!!

He also questions my reference to the Syriac in two in-

stances (1) Rom. vi, 4. Here he talks incoherently about the present preterite tense of the *verb*—that was not the point I made, but the expression “*descended into the baptismery.*”

His other instance is Hebrews vi. 2, *a passage I have in no way referred to!* How safely he could say, “We deny that the Syriac reads that way!” The other passage I did refer to, in the Syriac Version, was Hebrews ix. 13, to show him that the Syriac sustained my canon, *i. e.*, that wherever the verbs to sprinkle, or to pour, took an indivisible object as a direct accusative, the preposition *on*, or *upon*, must be understood; but whenever the expression was not *elliptical*, the preposition *on*, or *upon*, was expressed. He demands the Syriac and I will give the Syriac. If he will examine the thirteenth verse, instead of “sprinkling the unclean,” as in our version, it is, *ras al*, sprinkled *on* the unclean, *i. e.*, the blood and water was sprinkled, and not the persons. If he will look at the nineteenth verse, it is not “sprinkle both the book and all the people,” but *ras el*, sprinkled upon the book and all the people; and again, in the twenty-first verse, the preposition is repeated before both nouns—the tabernacle and vessels.

Here time compels me to close my replication. From these numerous instances which I have exposed, you must certainly be convinced that the statements of my opponent cannot be relied upon when he quotes from his authorities, or even the Word of God, to support his cause—much less when he states the positions of his opponent.—[*Time out.*]

NOTE.—By permission of Elder Ditzler, I give here a note received from Prof. Drisler, of Columbia College, New York—the American editor of Liddell & Scott's Lexicon—for the information of all. It was received since the close of the debate:

NEW YORK, February 9, 1876.

J. R. GRAVES, LL. D.:

Dear Sir:—Soon after the appearance of the American edition of Liddell & Scott's Greek Lexicon, changes were made in relation to the article *baptidzo*, which I never saw. Rev. Dr. Duncan, an Alumnus of our College, and at the time editor of the Southwest Baptist Chronicle (I think) of New Orleans, even before consulting me, denied the truth of any intentional alteration to suit any personal or sectarian views. In reply to a request from him, I stated what I here repeat to you: that the article *baptidzo* stood in the American Lexicon, as it was given in the

first English edition from which it was printed; the first half of the lexicon having been set up before the second edition was received. In this second edition the whole article is as follows:

Baptidzo, fut. *idso* (*bapto*) to dip repeatedly; of ships, to sink them, Polyb. 2, 51, 6, etc. Pass. to bathe, Eubul. Naus. 1; *hoi bebaptismenoi*, soaked in wine, Lat. *vino madedi*, Plat. Symp. 176 b; *ophlemasi bebaptisthai*, over head and ears in debt, Plat. Galb. 21; *meirakion baptizomenon*, a boy drowned with questions, Heind. Plat. Euthyd. 277 D. 2. to draw water, Plat. Alex. 67, cf. *bapto*. 3. to baptize, New Testament.

You will see that here the significations "to steep," "to wet," and "to pour upon," "drench," are omitted. I had no theory to maintain which should pervert the proper signification of the word, nor had the publishers; and I made no change in the article, as it stood in the English copy.

In the last English edition the article is given as follows:

Baptizoo fut. *ioo*, to dip in or under water, Aristoph, *philoön*, of ships, to sink them, Poly. 2, 51, etc.

EBaptisan teen polin, Metaph. of the crowds who flocked into Jerusalem at the time of the siege, Joseph. B. J. 4, 3, 3. Pers. *hoos ek tou bebaptisthai anapneousi* Hippocr. 5, 242 (Littr'e): to bathe, Eubal. *nausik* 1; Metaph. *bebaptismenoi*, soaked in wine, Lat. *vino madedi*, Plat. Symp. 176 B; *ophlemasi bebaptisthai*, over head and ears in debt, Plat. Galb. 21; *gnous baptizomenon to meirakion* seeing him drowned with questions, Herod. Plat. Euthyd. 177 D., 2 *phialais baptidzein ek krateroon* to draw wine from bowls in cups (of course by dipping them), Plat. Alex. 67, cf. *bapto* I. 3. III. to baptize, N. T. Eccl.

The above statement meets I trust, your entire question.

Yours very respectfully,

H. DRISLER.

DR. DITZLER'S EIGHTEENTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—As to Schleusner, we again ask the gentleman what did we suppress in the Louisville Debate? Only two Hebrew words and the three passages cited by Schleusner, but not quoted or defined. He quarrels with us here for quoting Hebrew, there he complains because we did not quote enough Hebrew when solely on Greek. But as we showed:

1. I read that part at Louisville—all, but neither I, nor my opponent, took the very unscholarly and absurd view of it that Dr. Graves does. We know that leaving out the references changed not Schleusner's meaning.

2. Dr. Graves always left out the same, and so did Elder Wilkes, A. Campbell, Ingham, and all.

3. By Dr. Graves' absurd interpretation of Schleusner's lexicon, he makes him say positively that *baptidzo* never means "immerse" in the New Testament. That, we showed, in a former speech.

4. To do this, he mistranslates *et* (and), changes the punctuation, and thus garbles the author.

5. We showed that Dr. Graves left out all this part that now is so important, and left out the word "pour," and that was the issue—did it ever mean pour? and quoting Schleusner he leaves that out, and declares in the same article that none of these authors gives sprinkle or pour! How does that look? Nay, quotes Passow among those who do not give "sprinkle or pour," though he gives "sprinkle" twice, and "pour upon" under *baptidzo*—yea, as the general meaning. Schleusner believed it was not modal in force, and applied to all our modes—sprinkle, pour, immerse—and used only in New Testament in sense of wash, cleanse, as applied to the rite of baptism. Hence, *baptismos* was "washing, purification, cleansing—*lotio, purgatio, ablutio*"—and the first definition of the other noun is

baptism, then immersion, etc. As to *hac* it refers to the definition he gave—immerse, dip, plunge—as one in meaning. A child could see that. Selden says, “*sive haec, sive illa*”—Lund. ii, 780, as often writers do, not regarding classic usage—utterly destroy this little conceit also. The more the Doctor says, the more he exhibits the fact, that in interpreting old Latin Fathers and writers, he is handling edged tools with which he is not familiar and gets cut. He has not learned that primitive does not mean first, even. He will learn by examination that Paul, Heb. vi. 2, uses the plural form of the word *baptisma*, the word in noun form for baptism in the New Testament. Doctrine of baptisms—they were plural. Why, by his position there were three in the apostolic church, and two continue yet, aside from the Spirit, as the baptism with fire he makes hurling them into hell—so baptism with water and into hell still continues, that makes two. Eph. iv. 4, one baptism refers distinctly to the oneness of spiritual influence. One baptism—that by which all are “born together in the [spiritual] likeness of his death,” all thus “baptized into one body by one spirit.”—1 Cor. xii. 13, a baptism, a circumcision, “made without hands.”—Col. ii. 11–12.

Tertullian's words are on record. For baptize, he uses these words: 1. *Baptidzo, tingo, adaspergo, perfundo, lavo, mergo, mergito*. That crushes Dr. Graves. Does he use *mergo* several times? He uses *adaspergo* and its noun four or five times (sprinkle), and on different occasions, as well as *perfundo*, sprinkle, while his *mergito* looks to three dips and a world of superstition. I need not waste time re-quoting on *tingo*. Except Ainsworth, who does not give dip nor immerse, and does give sprinkle, all the standards give *tingo*, “moisten,” “wet,” as the first meanings, and equivalent to three Greek words, *tengo*, applied to tears, and *deuo brecho*, applied to tears and rain mostly in all Greek—often in the Bible—and *hugraino*, “sprinkle with water,” from *hudor*, water, and *raino*, to sprinkle. Now, a word that all the standard lexicons, even his own lying there, thus define, he declares is “synonymous with *bapto*.” That is just so much aid to us.

As for Grotius, he was so prejudiced that Wall convicts him

of gross perversion of the facts, and his opinions on religious matters are always to be carefully examined into, ere received. He is not reliable on baptism at all. He says when he came to Syriac, I went off on Arabic. He stated distinctly that *amad* was the same in both. I held on to both. We know the Arabic has this advantage over all Semitic languages. 1. It is the only one that still lives. 2. It has a vast amount of literature, and hence from these two facts we are in no doubt or trouble as to the meaning of any Arabic word any more than over an English or German word. It is the main aid here, as all Oriental critics agree. I used the Arabic and Syriac together from the first.

As to Anabaptists, they were so called because they re-baptized all who joined them from the other party. These matters belong to future propositions.

He says, Tertullian says, "some say it will do," that is, sprinkling. Nothing of the kind. He is discussing whether the twelve apostles were baptized. "Others make the suggestion, forced enough, clearly, that the apostles then served the term of baptism when they, in their little ship, were sprinkled," etc. We read it all before. Now why did they recognize this (*alii*) others—leading theologians in that day—in trying to find out *where* the apostles were baptized—if *baptism was immersion*—how on earth could they suggest, and say, here is when they were immersed—the day they (*adpersi*) were sprinkled, when the storm dashed the waves against the little ship, and the spray *flew over them*? But Dr. Graves says not this, and he does say that. We say Tertullian here shows that in his day sprinkle was as readily and promptly recognized as baptism as *mergo* three times repeated. Nor did the Doctor give my quotation at all! It is strange how he does turn and twist.

Finally, on lexicons in Latin. You notice they all, save Furst, begin with *tingo*, or *tabhal*, and with *immersit* generally. Now, the same is the case with more accurate ones on *bapto*, though they do not end with immerse so habitually. Now, these same lexicons on words that do properly mean to immerse in Greek, Hebrew, Arabic, always begin with "*immersit*."

On *tabha*, that does mean to immerse, and they all use immerse promptly every place it occurs in the Bible. But we have eleven encyclopedias, all favoring the one or two he quoted. Indeed! Did he tell you how those works are generally gotten up? Did he tell you an immersionist wrote that article? Baptists watch the water question all the time. In others of them, men are hired to write, do it for a living, turn off all the matter they can. We have never deemed one of them worth looking into on this question, where close, laborious pains are demanded.

He brings up the Catholics. Now does he not know that they have used that question most unfairly? I admit he can quote from Bossuet and a few Catholics of that stripe, sentences favoring his side. But

1. He ought to know that they wrote those false statements solely and alone to encourage the fanatical Anabaptists, to inflame their zeal, animate their courage, and stimulate their passions, that civil war might desolate England and Germany, and give civil powers the pretense, and the Pope with them, of suppressing and exterminating Protestantism. The Baptists boast their want of sympathy with Protestantism. They avow themselves not Protestants. So do these Baptist books I have here. Now, it was the cunning of these priests to urge on to extremest excesses these Anabaptists, encouraging them in many ways, as they had no fear of them, as the learned and steady Presbyterians and Independents were the parties in England, the Lutherans in Germany, that they dreaded. So, likewise, in England, in the civil wars in the seventeenth century, Catholic priests, with authority from Rome in their boots, were taken, pretending to be extremest Independents in Cromwell's day, so as to drive Protestants into every excess, that re-action might come on, and the Catholic House of Stuart restored, which actually did take place, 1660. But

2. While their praise is shame, no intelligent Catholic will tell you that they claim that the Catholic church asserts the right to change the ordinance in the sense you assert it for them. Archbishop Kendrick, of Missouri now, whose work on baptism I have examined, urges that Paul, Luke, Mark,

to take place, as if discussion did not exist on pardon, regeneration, church government, etc., as well as baptism; and surely they are of more importance in our eyes. Now we assert, just the course he has pursued is the cause of all this strife and trouble on baptism. How has he met the points we have brought up? Why, he tells you I was two days in the lead. I knew that, I was a whole century ahead for that matter. He has dashed here, run yonder, and what has he accomplished? He began with philology himself, a solid hour spent, and only about three, if over two, minutes in adducing anything on baptism, three authors, one a Baptist, two of them out and out immersionists, that ended his speech, running over time, five minutes. We accepted the laws of interpretation, but not his way of applying by a great deal. We relied on philology, to settle the meaning of *baptidzo* ere we made application, just as workmen dress a stone all to the square, then fit it in its place. We expected beautiful work here. But me! when he saw my mailed Greeks, a Spartan band, in serried ranks bristling along the whole front of his works, to our utter surprise, he spiked his own cannon, and, with all his forces, made the swiftest time on record for Jordan and Euon. We soon overtook him there. He took his stand on *en* and *eis*, planted himself on them. But he slipped up on *eis*, and lost *en* in the struggle. We showed that they settled nothing at all. *Eis* occurs often in Bible Greek, even where verbs of motion occur, where water and Jordan occur, and yet simply means to, at, on. Kuhner, than whom a greater critic on Greek never lived, tells us *eis* is to express "in the direction whither." "In general, (it is used) to denote the reaching a definite limit. Buttmann: *eis*, to, into, in answer to whither." Liddell and Scott's lexicon tells him its "radical signification is direction towards, motion to, on, or into."

Scripture shows this to be true, as well as classic usage. "The sons of the prophets came *eis*, to the Jordan and cut wood." 2 Kings v. 4. We gave a number of passages to show this fact. Yet he boldly asserts it is into, its primary is into, in the face of every principle of the science of language.

You must, to accept his say so, shut your eyes as to facts. He appealed to *en*, and emphatically declared that *en* was as much—as often *in* in English as *in* was *in* in our tongue. We quoted many places. Let us repeat some:

From Exodus xxix. 2, to Num. xxxv. 25, “with oil,” in our version occurs forty-one times, “mingled with oil,” “anoined with oil,” the words being interspersed constantly with “poured the oil upon,” etc. Yet in the Greek it is *en* every time, not once omitting the *en*, *en elaio*, “with oil.” See Ex. xxix. 2. 40; Lev. ii. 4–7; ix. 1; xiv. 10, etc.; Num. vi. 15; vii. 13, 19, 25, 31, 37, 43 49, 55, 61, 67, 73, 79; xv. 4, 6, 9; xxviii. 5, 9, 12, 13, 20, 28; xxxv. 25, “anoined with the holy oil,” the high priest. This is enough. Not once do I find it expressed even by the simple *elaio*, as we might expect, yet every time it is *en* “with.” This forever settles the fact, that while *en*, expressive of locality is often equivalent to our *in*, *by*, *at*, yet whenever it indicates instrumentality, it is always *with*. But all agree that in the washing and “baptizing with water,” “with the Holy Spirit,” locality is not thought of or expressed at all, but instrumentality. We not only see, then, that *en* is perfectly consistent with affusion, as the pouring oil forty-one times consecutively shows, and Ezekiel kept it up (*en*), but points to affusion emphatically.

So likewise in cleansing a house, sprinkling it *en to hamati*, with the blood of the bird, and *en to hudati*, with the water, etc. People were fed in the cave (*en*) with bread and water. We could cite hundreds of examples. We showed all this, hence of course his argument was utterly destroyed. He had, as yet proved nothing at all. His wild dash at dative of *wherein* and *where*. Why, what had that use of the dative to do here? It was not a question *where* was the Spirit of the fire with which Christ was to baptize the people? nor, where was the water? for he had told us where were the places of baptism. It was solely of these elements as the means—the instrumentality of their baptism—*with* water, *with* the Spirit, *with* fire they were to be baptized. Even if it had been location it served not his cause. People stood still *in* Jordan, “came up out of Jordan,”—that implied that they went *eis*, *into*, Jordan, were “*in* the

midst of Jordan." Joshua iii. 8, iv. 8, 16-21, and Elijah, dwelt *in the brook*." Cases of this kind are numerous. Hence nothing is as yet proved. He went to Romans vi. 4, assuming that it was water baptism. We showed it was not. He relied wholly on the word bury. We showed it was a spiritual burial into death to sin—a strong term indicating entire death to sin. We showed that the term in Greek and English is used in Jeremiah, xxii. 19, "buried with be burial of an ass"—where the party was left above ground—no covering up, no interment. Hence it proved nothing. He fell back on the word *plant*. We showed that it was never used in Scripture for *interment*, or covering up, the Greek term. It applied to planting trees, vineyards, engrafting together, to be *born* together. Hence it was a beautiful allusion to our being engrafted together in the death of Jesus—which was crucifixion, not a death under the water—and hence, by this we are crucified with Christ—always delivered *eis* into death, 2 Cor. iv. 10-12.

Failing on all points, the Doctor waxed desperate with imagination, and struck wildly in the air, hoping an awkward, aimless lick would do more execution than studied blows. He attacked Furst, Ewing, lexical authorities, and made an assault on my use of classic Greek in one, as to dip. But he failed here badly. As to attacking the centre of my position, he never even made a *feint* that way.

Meantime we made—unchecked—our entire philological argument from beginning to end on Greek, as to *baptidzo*, 1. The lexicons—all with us, 2. Immersionist authorities of highest repute, all bore down on the immersion theory with crushing weight, that fearful record of devastating facts he has never noticed. 3. We appealed to the classic use and it perfectly established sprinkle as the primary meaning of *baptidzo*. 4. We appealed to the laws and principles of language, by the laws established to find *derivatives* and *primitives*, and they with infallible certainty, pointed out and demonstrated sprinkle as the primary meaning of *baptidzo*. These facts he has passed by in silence. We turned to the ancient Versions. These have been used by immersionists with great force and persis-

tent zeal, but we showed they had used them as they had the lexicons. They sustained affusion with one voice from apostolic times to the sixteenth century. Their voice was one unanimous and emphatic assertion of affusion as the only apostolic practice. There was no uncertainty in the sound. It was not involved in any kind of doubt. It was emphatic.

We turned to the Hebrew. 1. The lexicons were a unit for us. They at once ranged themselves along with the Greek and Syriac lexicons. 2. We appealed to the original text, "the ultimate authority;" and like the Greek, it sustained the utmost of the lexicons. 3. We appealed to the root, the stem syllable, that gives the tone, is the key to the primary and fundamental signification of the word. It was sprinkle.

We appealed to the Greek Fathers, Origen, Irenæus, Basil, Hippolytus, Euthymus, Clemens Alexandrinus, all, all sustained sprinkling as baptism. They supported pouring water on objects as modes of baptism. We turned to Tertullian, Cyprian, Jerome, Julianus, Augustine, they all supported affusion for baptism.

We presented the Laver, we gave its history, dimensions, height, uses, laws, all from the Bible. We showed that for fifteen hundred years every Jew baptized himself. It was a telling record. It goes to mankind in this great debate. It was a record for affusion all the way through. Any one of the arguments we have adduced defeats the Doctor's proposition. He has not met a single one of our arguments. We appeal to the record. How crushing, then, how grinding, yea, grinds to powder and thinnest dust, all his arguments, unearths every position in which he hid, and leaves him to the pitiless force of inexorable logic and the crushing weight of invincible truth.

He attacked Furst, the great German Rabbi, the pride and glory of Jewish scholarship, and Leigh, of Leipsic, with a bitterness not becoming the Doctor's reputation. If the Doctor prefers to live in the learning of the dark ages, or in its mere twilight, when the grammars, and lexicons and helps to learning were crude and full of defects, he can do so; but to so bitterly assail those great thinkers who press on into newer

and grander fields, is not the better course. We tell him now, immersion will go to the wall. It is doomed. The facts are all with us, and all the world cannot meet them. It is only a question of time.

On the contrary, he clung to Liddell and Scott as death to its victim. They took him under special charge. Anthon, the immersionist Episcopalian, and Drisler worked up the case, they threw "pour upon" out. It is good now. No, they throw "pour" out of his definition of *luo*, full brother of *baptidzo*. Now it will do. No, "dip repeatedly" as a first meaning won't do. Out it goes. Now we can rest. No, no; no immerse in it yet. We must have that in. So they change it again. And so they keep on tinkering at it from year to year. It shows how one-sided, short-sighted their leaders are, and how hard to get right even from their own stand-point. Dr. Graves has tried hard to invalidate the Syriac version also.

But here again he failed. 1. We quoted Drs. Judd, and J. R. Graves, and Gale, three distinguished Baptists, squarely against our opponent. 2. We quoted Origen, and the whole Oriental church against him, where not a single argument can be brought against its apostolicity, but masses can be for it. 3. We quoted a host of the greatest Oriental scholars, immersionists and all, who hold that it was made in the apostolic age, so early, too, that the three or four last books written, Revelation and Jude—e. g., being written after the Syriac version was made, were not in the old Syriac canon. It is with these massive volumes of truth that we go before the world, and challenge their respect for the mode we prefer, because it alone is apostolic.—[*Time out.*

DR. GRAVES' NINETEENTH, CLOSING SPEECH.

MR PRESIDENT.—I concluded my last speech with the testimony of the standard historians of the Lutheran church. I will now continue with those of the Presbyterian church, the Congregational, and the Methodist, with the admissions of the most learned scholars and commentators of these denominations, and conclude my argument with the important testimony of the cyclopedias, when my proof will all be before you, and a brief summary of my argument will close the discussion of this proposition on my part. It is by facts, and not by declamation, or assertions, that this question must be settled.

Testimony of the Historians of the Presbyterian Church.

J. G. Altman (1697–1758), a Swiss historian and divine, also professor of moral philosophy and Greek at Berne, says:

“In the primitive church persons to be baptized were not sprinkled, but entirely immersed in water, which was performed according to the example of John the Baptist.”—On 1 Cor. xv. 29, sec. 8.

Dr. Philip Schaff Ph. D., born 1819, educated at the Universities of Zúbingen, Halle and Berlin, professor of theology at Mercersburg, Penn., author of History of the Apostolic Church, History of the Christian Church of the First Six Centuries, and about a dozen other works of much value, says:

“The usual form (in the apostolic church) of the act was immersion, as is plain from the original meaning of the Greek, *baptizein* and *baptismos*.” “Immersion, and not sprinkling, was unquestionably the original, normal form (of baptism). This is shown by the very meaning of the Greek word *baptidzo*, *baptisma*, and the analogy of the baptism of John, which was performed in the Jordan (*en*), Matt. iii. 6, compare with 16, also, *eis ton Jordanen* (into the Jordan), Mark i, 9; furthermore, by the New Testament comparisons of baptism with the passage through the Red Sea, 1 Cor. x. 2, with the flood, 1 Peter ii, 21, with a bath, Eph. v, 36, Titus iii, 5, with a burial and resurrection, Rom. vi, 4, Col. ii. 12; finally, by the general usage of ecclesiastical antiquity, which was *always immersion*, as it

is to this day in the Oriental, and also in the Græco-Russian churches, pouring and sprinkling being substituted only in cases of urgent necessity, such as sickness and approaching death.—Hist. Apos. Ch., p. 568.

J. A. Turretin (1671–1737), professor of Church History at Geneva, and who published five vols. on church history, says:

“And indeed baptism was performed in that age and in those countries by immersion of the whole body into water.”—Com. on Rom. vi. 3, 4.

P. A. Limborch, a scholar of note and professor of theology in the University of Amsterdam, (1670), author of complete system of Divinity, History of the Inquisition, Commentator, etc., says:

“Baptism, then, consists in washing or rather immersing the whole body into water, as was customary in the primitive times.”—Syst. Div., 3, v., ch. xxvii., sec. 1, on Rom. vi. 4.

“The apostle alludes to the manner of baptizing, not as practiced at this day, which is performed by sprinkling of water, but as administered of old in the primitive church, by immersing the whole body in water, a short continuance in the water, and a speedy emersion out of the water.

Baptism is a figure and mark of our spiritual burial, for by that immersion into water, and continuance under the water, which represents a burial, baptized persons express their being buried to sin.—Com. Rom. vi. 4.

Let all notice that what Stokius means by “*formerly*,” is what all other Historians mean by “of old,” “anciently,” “in the primitive church,” and not as Eld. D. may claim, a few hundred years ago.

F. Spauheim, a scholar, and author of a work on Church History, who died 1701, says:

“This rite of immersing and of bringing out of the baptismal waters was common and promiscuous in the apostolic age, hence the apostle alludes to it as a rite common to all Christians. Rom. vi. 4, Col. ii, 12.”—Disput. De Bap. pro. Martius p. 16.

“To be baptized is denominated by Paul a being buried, according to the ancient manner of baptizing; for immersion is a kind of burial and emersion, a resurrection, to which the apostle alludes Col. ii. 12. So Christ being baptized, went up out of the water, Matt. iii, 16. The same is related concerning the Æthiopian eunuch, Acts viii. 38.”—Dubiorum Evang., Pt. iii. dub. xxiv. sec. 2.

“In the primitive church immediately subsequent to the age of the apostles, this (immersion) was undeniably the common mode of baptism. The utmost that can be said of sprinkling in that early period is, that it was, in a case of necessity, permitted as an exception to a general rule. This fact is so well established that it were needless to adduce authorities

in proof of it. It is a great mistake to suppose that baptism by immersion was discontinued when infant baptism became generally prevalent; the practice of immersion continued even unto the thirteenth or fourteenth century. Indeed, it has never been formally abandoned, but is still the mode of administering baptism in the Greek church and in several of the Eastern churches."

"The first baptistery or place appointed to baptism of which any mention is made, occurs in a biography of the fourth century, and this was prepared in a private house."—Ancient Christ. Ex., ch. xix., sec. 10.

Testimony of the Historians of the Congregational Church.

Dr. James Murdoch (1776–1856), a graduate of Yale College, professor of languages in the University of Vermont, also of rhetoric and Church history in the Theological Seminary of Andover, and author of many valuable works and translations of various books from other languages, says.

"The baptisteries were properly buildings adjacent to the churches, in which the catechumens were instructed, and where were a sort of cisterns into which water was let at the time of baptism, and in which the candidates were baptized by immersion."—Eecl. Hist., vol. i. p. 281. Note 16.

The recent testimony of Prof. Paine, of the Bangor Theological Seminary, I gave in opening my historical argument, to which the reader is referred.

Testimony of the Historians of the Methodist Church.

Methodists are fully committed to the testimony of Mosheim, the great Lutheran Historian, since his history has been republished in this country for years by their Book Concerns, and it is made the historical text-book for their young ministers. Mosheim, we have seen, says, without qualification, that in the first and second centuries baptism was administered by the apostolic and primitive churches by a total immersion of the believer in water. Sprinkling, with infant baptism, salt, chrism, the cross, sponsors, etc., that crept in in the third and fourth centuries, were innovations.

Gregory & Ruter's history appeared in 1833. Martin Ruter was the President of Augusta College.

First Century. "The initiatory rite of baptism was usually performed by immersing the whole body in the baptismal font, and in the earlier periods of Christianity was permitted to all who acknowledged the truths

of the Gospel, and promised conformity to its laws.”—Gregory & Ruter’s Church History, p. 34.

Second Century. “Baptism was publicly performed twice a year. The catechumens (or probationers for baptism) assembled in the church on the great festivals of Easter and Whitsuntide; and after a public declaration of their faith, and a solemn assurance from their sponsors that it was their intention to live conformably to the Gospel, they received the sacrament of baptism. This rite was performed by three immersions, and the body was divested of clothes. In order to preserve decency in the operation, the baptismal font of the women was separated from that of the men, and they were as much as possible attended by the deaconesses of the church. Baptism by aspersion was permitted to the sick; and in cases where a sufficient quantity of water for immersion could not be procured. The sign of the cross was made use of in this rite; and a solemn prayer was uttered on consecrating the baptismal water. Confirmation immediately succeeded the performance of this rite.”—Gregory & Ruter’s Church history, p. 53.

The reader will notice that the single immersion was the only act known in the first century, and that trine immersion, practiced by those churches that were lapsing into the apostasy, came with other and manifold innovations, and Tertulian confesses it was more than the Scriptures required.

An abridgment of this history was published in 1840 by the Northern Book Concern, New York, under the name of Ruter’s Church History, which continues to be one of the Society’s standard publications. Now, all mention of how baptism was administered in the first century is suppressed! Why?

Under the second century I find this:

“Baptism was publicly performed twice a year. The candidates for this ordinance assembled in the church on the festivals of Easter and Whitsuntide; and after a solemn declaration of their faith, and an assurance that they renounced the pomp and vanities of the world, and that they were determined to live conformably to the Gospel, they received the sacrament of baptism. This rite was administered without the public assemblies, in places prepared for the purpose, and was performed by an immersion of the whole body in the baptismal font. (Mosheim’s Eccl. Hist.) It was also performed by aspersion or sprinkling. The sign of the cross was made use of in this rite, and a solemn prayer was uttered on consecrating the baptismal water.”—Ruter’s Church History, p. 41.

It will be seen that authority is given for the practice of immersion, but none for the unwarranted assertion that it was also performed by aspersion or sprinkling. But this act originated with those who invented “signing with the cross,”

“consecrating the baptismal water,” “sponsors,” “god fathers,” which Ruter admits were human inventions.

Argument from the Testimony of Cyclopedias.

I now produce a body of unsectarian witnesses, the encyclopedists. Religious cyclopedists I will reject, for they are sectarian, and therefore liable to be prejudiced. Literary and scientific, or national, cyclopedias are more likely to be unbiased by partisan zeal. What do they say of the meaning of *baptidzo* and the practice of the primitive churches?

1. The Edinburgh Encyclopedia says :

“In the time of the apostles the form of baptism was very simple. The person to be baptized was dipped in a river or vessel, with the word which Christ had ordained, and, to express more fully his change of character, generally assumed a new name.”

“It was not till 1311 that the legislature in a council held at Ravenna, declared immersion or sprinkling to be indifferent.” “In this country (Scotland), however, sprinkling was never practiced in ordinary cases before the Reformation. From Scotland it made its way into England, in the reign of Elizabeth, but was not authorized by the established church. In the Assembly of Divines, held at Westminster in 1643, it was keenly debated whether immersion or sprinkling should be adopted; twenty-five voted for sprinkling, and twenty-four voted for immersion; and even that small majority was attained at the earnest request of Dr. Lightfoot, who had acquired great influence in the Assembly.”

Speaking of ancient baptisteries, it says :

“Baptistery; in ecclesiastical writers, a place in which the ceremony of baptism is performed.” “Baptisteries were anciently very capacious; because, as Dr. Cote observes, the stated times of baptism returning but seldom, there were usually great multitudes to be baptized at the same time, and then, the manner of baptizing by immersion, or dipping under water, made it necessary to have a large font likewise.”

2. Brand's Cyclopedia says :

“Baptism (Greek, *bapto*, I dip), was originally administered by immersion, which act is thought by some necessary to the sacrament.”

3. Chamber's Cyclopedia says :

“Baptism, in theology formed from the Greek *baptidzo*, or *bapto*, I dip, or plunge.” “Some are of opinion that sprinkling, in baptism, was begun in cold countries. It was introduced into England about the beginning of the ninth century.”

4. National Cyclopedia : “The manner in which the rite was performed appears to have been at first by complete im-

mersion." In regard to the early custom of the English church, it says: "It was the practice of the English, from the beginning, to immerse the whole body."

5. The Encyclopedia Britannica describes the process of changing from the primitive custom. It says:

"Several of our Protestant divines, flying into Germany and Switzerland during the bloody reign of Queen Mary, and returning home when Queen Elizabeth came to the crown, brought back with them a great zeal for the Protestant churches beyond the sea, where they had been sheltered and received; and having observed that at Geneva, and other places, baptism was administered by sprinkling, they thought they could not do the church of England a greater service than by introducing a practice dictated by so great an authority as Calvin."

6. Rees' Cyclopedia says of baptism: "In primitive times this ceremony was performed by immersion."

7. Penny Cyclopedia.—"The manner in which it was performed appears to have been at first by immersion."

8. Encyclopedia Metropolitana.—"We readily admit that the literal meaning of the word baptism is immersion, and that the desire of resorting again to the most ancient practice of the church, of immersing the body, which has been expressed by many divines, is well worthy of being considered."

9. Encyclopedia Americana.—"Baptism (that is, dipping, immersing, from the Greek *baptidzo*), was usual with the Jews even before Christ." "In the time of the apostles, the form of baptism was very simple. The person to be baptized was dipped in a river or vessel with the words which Christ had ordered, and to express more fully his change of character, generally adopted a new name."

10. The Encyclopedia Ecclesiastica says:

"Whatever weight, however, may be in these reasons, as a defence for the present practice of sprinkling, it is evident that during the first ages of the church, and for many centuries afterward, the practice of immersion prevailed."

Here is the testimony of ten literary and historic standards, the ablest and most trustworthy in our language. They were not written for sectarian purposes, to defend anybody's dogma, nor in the interest of any party or sect, but as scientific, literary and historic standards for all classes, parties and peoples, aiming only at facts, truth. They all agree as to the practice of the apostolic church, corroborating just what all the dictionaries assert, that baptism was immersion. They also tell us that sprinkling was gradually introduced, first in

the case of the sick who could not leave their beds, and that in from one thousand to thirteen hundred years after Christ, it came into general use in Germany, France and Great Britain. Can we rely upon their testimony? If not, upon whose testimony can we rely? Ought not their testimony alone to be conclusive?

Argument from the Testimony of the Most Eminent Pedobaptists.

BECKMAN.—“Baptism, according to the force of its etymology, is immersion, and washing, or dipping.”—*Exercit. Theol.*, Exercit xvii.

BUCANUS.—“Baptism, that is, immersion, dipping, and, by consequence, washing. Baptistry, a vat, or large vessel of wood, or stone, in which we are immersed, for the sake of washing. Baptist, one that immerses, or dips.”—*Inst. Theol.*, loc. xlvii., quæ. i.

ZANCHY.—“Baptism is a Greek word, and signifies two things; first, and properly, it signifies immersion in water, for the proper signification of *baptidzo* is to immerse, to plunge under, to overwhelm in water.”—*Opera tom.* vi.

VITRINGA.—“The act of baptizing is the immersion of believers in water. This expresses the force of the word.”—*Aphor. Sanc. Theol.* Apho. 884.

HOSPINIAN.—“Christ commanded us to be baptized, by which word it is certain immersion is signified.”—*Hist. Sacr.* b. ii. c. i. p. 30.

VOSSIUS.—“*Baptidzein*, to baptize, signifies to plunge. It certainly signifies more than *epipoladzien*,” etc.—*Dispu de Bap. Disp.* i. thes. i. Also, baptism “is done by a trine immersion”

“That the apostles immersed when they baptized there is no doubt.”—*Disp. on Bap. Dis.* i. § 6.

MAGDEBURG CENTURIATORS.—“The word *baptidzo*, to baptize, which signifies immersion into water, proves that the administrator of baptism immersed, or washed, the persons baptized in water”—*Cent.* i. b. ii. c. iv.

IKENIUS.—“The Greek word *baptismos* denotes the immersion of a thing, or a person, into something, either with a view to expiation, or for washing and cleansing”—*Disser. Philol. Theol.* *Disser.* xix.

DEYLINGIUS.—“The word *baptizesthai*, as used by Greek authors, signifies immersion and overwhelming. Thus we read in Plutarch (*baptison scauton eis thalassan*), Dip yourself in the sea, like as Naaman (in 2 Kings v. 14) who baptized himself seven times in Jordan, which was an immersion of the whole body. So Strabo.”—*Obs. Sac. pars* iii. obs. sec. 2.

GÜRTLERUS.—“To baptize, among the Greeks, is undoubtedly to immerse, to dip; and baptism is immersion, dipping. - - - The thing commanded by our Lord is baptism—immersion in water.”—*Inst. Theo.* cap. xxxiii. sec., 108-115.

REISKIUS.—“To be baptized signifies, in its primary sense, to be immersed.”

BISHOP BOSSUET.—“To baptize signifies to plunge, as is granted by all the world.” “It is certain that St. John the Baptist baptized no other way than by dipping—and his example shows that to baptize a great number of people, those places were chosen where there was a great deal of water.”—See Stennett’s Answer to Russen, p. 174.

WALÆUS.—“The external form of baptism is immersion into water, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.”—Enchiridium p. 425.

Dionysius Petavius, speaking of the church’s pretended power to alter or to impose, says :

“And indeed immersion is properly styled *baptismos*, though at present we content ourselves with pouring water on the head, which in Greek is called *perichusis*.”—Dogm. Theol. 1. iii., de peni., cap. i., sec. 11.

CATTENBURGH.—“In baptism the whole body is ordered to be immersed.”—Spicil. Theol., 1. iv., c. lxiv., sec. ii., 22.

This is what I maintain. If *baptidzo* signifies to sprinkle upon, then the whole body is to be sprinkled or poured upon, and not the head or face only.

BUDDEUS.—“The words *baptidzein* and *baptismos* are not to be interpreted of aspersion, but always of immersion.”—Theol. Dogm. 1. v., c. i., sec. 5.

Bishop Taylor teaches that Scriptural baptism is “not sprinkling, but immersion, in pursuance of the sense of the word in the commandment and the example of our blessed Savior.”

TYNDALE.—“The plunging into water signifieth that we die and are buried with Christ, as concerning the olde life of sinne, which is Adam : and the pulling out againe signifieth that we rise againe with Christ in a newe life.”—Obe. of a Chris. Man, p. 143, edi. 1571.

SELDEN.—“In England of late years I ever thought the parson baptized his own fingers rather than the child.”—Works, vol. vi. col. 2008.

DR. OWEN.—“The original and natural signification of the word *baptidzo* imports to dip, to plunge, to dye.”—In Dr. Ridgeley’s Bod. Div., ques. clxvi.

DR. WHITBY.—“Baptism, therefore, is to be performed not by sprinkling, but by washing the body.”—Com. on Matt. iii. 16.

DR. PORSON.—“The Baptists have the advantage of us. *Baptidzo* signifies a total immersion.” (The substance of a conversation with Dr. Newman.) See Dr. N. on Baptism, p. 20.

ESTIUS (Roman Catholic and Chancellor of the University of Douay).—“The immersion and emersion performed in baptism are a kind of representation of death and resurrection.”—Com, on the Epis., on 1 Cor. xv. 29.

ARNOLDI (Roman Catholic).—“BAPTIDZEIN, to immerse, to submerge. It

was, as being an entire submersion under the water, since washings were already a confession of impurity and a symbol of purification, the confession of entire impurity and a symbol of entire purification."—Com. on Matt. iii. 6.

G. BIRD—"It can scarcely be disputed that immersion of adults is the only form of baptism of which we find any traces in the Scriptures."—On the Angl. Church, p. 69

SHOLZ—"Baptism consists in the immersion of the whole body in water—On Matt. iii. 6

FRITSCHKE—"That baptism was performed, not by sprinkling, but by immersion, is evident not only from the nature of the word, but from Rom. vi. 4."—Com., on Matt. iii. 6.

AUGUSTI—"The word 'baptism' according to *etymology* and *usage*, signifies to immerse, submerge," etc.

RHEINHARD—"In sprinkling, the symbolical meaning of the ordinance is wholly lost."—Ethics, vol. v., p. 79.

DR. CHALMERS—"The original meaning of the word baptism is immersion."—Lect. on Rom. vi, 4.

MEYER—"Immersion, which the word in classic Greek, and in the New Testament, everywhere means."—Com. on N. T., on Mark vii. 4.

OLSHAUSEN—"The elements of repentance and regeneration, united in the sacrament of baptism, and prefigured by immersion and emersion (see Com. at Rom. vi, 3, etc.,) were separate from one another in the latter practice of the church when infant baptism came into use"—Com., on Acts xvi, 14, 15

DR. STIER—"The perfect *immersion* is not accidental in form, but manifestly intended in the *baptidzein eis*."—Words, etc., vol. viii, p. 306.

CONYBEARE AND HOWSON—"It is needless to add that baptism was (unless in exceptional cases) administered by immersion, the convert being plunged beneath the surface of the water to represent his death to the life of sin, and then raised from this momentary burial to represent his resurrection to the life of righteousness. It must be a subject of regret that the general discontinuance of this original form of baptism (though perhaps necessary in our northern climates) has rendered obscure to popular apprehension some very important passages of Scripture."—Life and Epistles of St. Paul, vol. i., p. 518.

ARCHB. SUMNER—"John was baptizing, i. e. immersing in water, those who came to him for this purpose, 'confessing their sins.'"—Exp. Lec., on John i., 19-28.

NEANDER—"John's followers were entirely immersed in the water."—Life of Christ, p. 55.

DR. LANGE—"John administered the rite of submersion." "His idea of repentance exceeded, in the outward requirements of the Mosaic law, as much as his rite of immersion did that of sprinkling." *And were baptized, immersed, in the Jordan, confessing their sins. Immersion was the symbol of repentance. According to Meyer, repentance was symbolized by im-*

mersion, because, etc.”—Com. on Matt. vol. i., pp. 113, 115, 118. Clark’s ed.

Contrast this honest statement of Dr. Lange with an apparent appeal to ignorance on the import of a Greek word, by my opponent.

DR. ALFORD—“The baptism of proselytes was administered” “by immersion of the whole person.” “It is most probable that John’s baptism in outward form resembled that of proselytes.”—Gr. Tes. on Matt. iii. 6,

BP. BROWNE—“The language of the New Testament and of the primitive fathers sufficiently points to immersion as the common mode of baptism. John the Baptist baptized in the river Jordan (Matt. iii.); Jesus is represented as ‘coming out of the water’ after His baptism (Mark i. 10). Again, John is said to have baptized in Enon because there was much water there (John iii. 23; see also Acts viii. 36).”—In Dr. W. Smith’s Dic. of the Bible, Art. Bap.

All these are Pedobaptists, and I could add as many more, did time permit. Certainly the testimony of any one should many times out-weigh the bare assertions of my opponent.

Argument from the Conjoint Testimony of the Fathers of the Reformation and of Methodism.

On this wise, Calvin comments on John iii, 22, 23:

“It is probable that after the feast, Christ came into that part of Judea which was in the neighborhood of Enon, a town situated in the tribe of Manasseh. In that place the evangelist says there was much water (*aquæ multæ*) which did not so generally abound in Judea. Geographers state that these two towns, Enon and Salim, were not far from the confluence of the Jordan and Jabbok, near which they place Scythopolis. Moreover, from these words [John iii. 22, 23] we may learn that John and Christ administered baptism by the submersion of the whole body (*totius corporis submersione*).”

“And Philip commanded the chariot to stand still; and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him.”

Looking into Calvin’s commentary on this verse we see that he explains thus:

“From this verse we clearly see what was the rite of baptism among the ancients; for they were accustomed to immerse the whole body in water (*totum corpus in aquam*). At the present time (sixteenth century) the practice has gained ground for the minister only to sprinkle water on the body or head.” “The very word *baptize*, however, signifies to immerse; and it is certain that immersion was the practice of the ancient church.”

ZUINGLE.—“*Into His death.* When ye were immersed (*intingeremini*) into the water of Baptism, ye were ingrafted into the death of Christ—

that is, the immersion (*intinctio*) of your body into water was a sign that ye ought to be ingrafted into Christ and his death, that as Christ died and was buried, ye also may be dead to the flesh and the old man—that is, to yourselves.—Anno. on Rom. vi. 3.

LUTHER.—“Baptism is a Greek word, and may be translated immersion, as when we immerse something in water that it may be wholly covered; and, although it is almost wholly abolished (for they do not dip the whole, children, but only pour a little water on them), they ought, nevertheless, to be wholly immersed, and then immediately drawn out, for that the etymology of the word seems to demand.” The Germans call baptism *tauff*, from a *depth*, which in their language they call *tieff*, because it is proper those who are baptized be deeply immersed.”

In the Smalcald Articles, drawn up by Luther, he says:

“Baptism is nothing else than the Word of God with immersion in water,”

And again he says:

“Washing from sins is attributed to baptism; it is truly indeed attributed, but the signification is too soft and slow to express baptism, which is rather a sign both of death and resurrection. Being moved by this reason, I would have those that are to be baptized to be altogether dipped into the water, as the word doth sound, and the mystery doth signify.”

John Wesley (1703–1791), the noted preacher, scholar, author, and founder of Wesleyan Methodists in 1729, says:

“Buried with him, alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion.—Note on Rom. vi. 4

“The ancient manner of baptizing by immersion is manifestly alluded to here”—On Col. ii. 12

In his Journal for Georgia of February 21, 1736, he says:

“Mary Welch, aged eleven days, was baptized according to the custom of the *first* church and the rule of the church of England, by immersion.”

Adam Clark, LL. D., F. S. A., (1760–1832), the celebrated and standard commentator of the M. E. Church:

“It is probable that the apostle here alludes to the mode of administering baptism by immersion, the whole body being put under the water”—*In Loco*

“When he (the person baptized) came up out of the water, he seemed to have a *resurrection* to life. He was therefore supposed to throw off his old Gentile state, as he threw off his clothes, and to assume a new character, as the baptized generally put on new or fresh garments”—Comment on Rom. vi., 4.

“That the baptism of John was by *plunging* the body (after the same manner as the washing unclean persons—was) seems to appear from those things which are related of him; namely, that he *baptized in Jordan*, that he baptized in Enon, *because there was much water there*,” etc.—Comm. at the end of Mark.

“‘Buried,’ etc., alluding to the immersion practiced in the case of adults, when the person appeared to be buried under the water, as Christ was buried in the heart of the earth; his rising again the third day, and their emerging from the water, was an emblem of the resurrection of the body, and a total change of life.”—Com. on Col. ii. 12.

“But as they receive baptism as an emblem of death, in voluntarily going under the water, so they receive it as an emblem of the resurrection unto eternal life, in coming up out of the water; thus they are *baptized for the dead*, in perfect faith of the resurrection.—Com. on I Cor. xv.

The Admissions of Twenty-two of the Most Eminent Presbyterian Scholars and Commentators.

Since our Presbyterian friends seem so ready to endorse the assertions of my opponent, that *baptidzo* does not properly mean “to immerse,” and that Rom. vi. 3 does not refer to water baptism, and that immersion was not *the* act John, the apostles, and all the apostolic and primitive churches observed, I wish to place before them, especially the testimony of twenty-two, and I could easily double the number, of their most eminent scholars and theologians, from the days of Calvin down to this day. I wish to ask them if they will throw all these overboard into the deep and accept the assertions of one man, Eld. Ditzler, as of more weight? Between Eld. Ditzler and all these they must choose.

CALVIN.—“The word baptize signifies to *immerse*; and it is certain that immersion was the practice of the ancient church.”—Inst., S. 4, ch. xv., sec. 19.

James Macknight (1721–1800), an eminent Scotch divine and critic, thirty years a minister in Edinburgh, and twenty years moderator of the General Assembly of Scotland, author of the *Harmony of the Four Gospels*, *The Truth of the Gospel History and Translation of all the Epistles*, with *Commentaries and Notes*, says;

“Jesus submitted to be baptized—that is, buried under the water by John, and to be raised out of it again, as an emblem of his future death and resurrection

In like manner the baptism of believers is emblematical of their own death, burial and resurrection.” “Planted together in the likeness of his death. The burying of Christ and of believers, first in the water of baptism, and afterwards in the earth, is fitly enough compared to the planting of seed in the earth, because the effect in both cases is a reviviscence to a state of greater perfection.”—Apost. Epis., Note on Rom. vi. 4, 5.

Dr. Geo. Campbell (1719–1796), an eminently learned minister, theological professor, church historian, translator, and President of Marischal College, Scotland, says :

“The word baptism, both in sacred authors and in classical, signifies to dip, to plunge, to immerse. Had *baptidzo* been employed in the sense of *raino*, to sprinkle (which, as far as I know, it never is, IN ANY USE, sacred or classical), the expression would doubtless have been, ‘I indeed baptize water upon you.’ ”

DR. THOMAS CHALMERS.—The original meaning of the word baptism is immersion.” “We doubt not that baptism was administered in the apostles’ days by an actual submerging of the whole body under water. (On Rom. vi. 3, 4). We advert to this for the purpose of throwing light on the analogy that is instituted in these verses. Jesus Christ, by death, underwent this sort of baptism by an immersion under the surface of the ground, whence he soon emerged again by his resurrection. We, by being baptized into his death, are conceived to have made a similar translation—in the act of descending under the water of baptism, to have resigned an old life, and in the act of ascending, to emerge into a second or new life.

Isaac Casaubon (1559–1614), a Calvinistic theologian and critic, Greek professor at Geneva fourteen years, also held the chair of Greek and Belles Lettres in the University of Montpellier, and most critical Greek scholar of his age, says :

“This was the rite of baptizing, that persons were plunged into the water, which the very word *baptidzein*, to baptize, sufficiently declares ; which, as it does not signify *dunein*, to sink to the bottom and perish, so doubtless it is not *epipoladzein*, to swim on the surface. For these three words, *epipoladzein*, *baptidzein* and *dunein* are of different significations. Whence we understand it was not without reason, that some long ago insisted on the immersion of the whole body in the ceremony of baptism ; for they urge the word *baptidzein*, to baptize.—Annot. in Matt. iii. 6.

P Van Mastricht, a scholar of reputation, and author of works on theology, who died in 1706, says :

“In baptism we emerge out of a sepulchre of water and pass, as it were, into a new life.”—Theoret. Prac. Theol., b. vii., ch. iv, sec. 10.

“Immersion was used by the apostles and primitive churches.—(Rom, vi. 3, 4, 5,)”—Ibid., sec 9.

James Basnage, a man of great learning, a church historian who died in 1723, says :

“This (the response of Pope Stephen in the year 754) is accounted the first law against immersion. The Pontiff, however, did not dispense with immersion, except in case of extreme necessity. This law, therefore, did not change the mode of dipping in public baptism, as it was not till five hun-

dred and fifty-seven years after, that the legislature, in a council at Ravenna, in the year 1311, declared immersion and pouring indifferent."—*Monumenta*, vol. 1., Præfat, ch. v., sec. 4.

G. Diodati (1576–1649), a Swiss theologian and preacher of note, professor of Hebrew and theology at Geneva, one of the best Biblical scholars of his day, both an author and translator, says:

"In baptism, being dipped in water according to the ancient ceremony, it is a sacred sign unto us that sin ought to be drowned in us by God's Spirit."

Richard Baxter (1615–1691, a distinguished preacher, author of *Saints' Rest* and about one hundred and forty-four other distinct treatises, says on Matt. iii- 6 :

"We grant that baptism then (in primitive times) was by washing the whole body." "In our baptism we are dipped under the water, as signifying our covenant profession, that as He was buried for sin, so we are dead and buried to sin."

Dr. John W. Nevin, born 1803, an American theologian, and professor of Hebrew and Biblical literature ten years in the Theological Seminary at Alleghany City, also President of the College and Theological Seminary at Mercersburg, Penn., editor of the *Mercersburg Review*, and author of a number of books, says in the *Mercersburg Review* :

"It needs but ordinary scholarship, and the freedom of a mind unpledged to mere party interests, to see and acknowledge here [that the Baptists have] a certain advantage on the subject of baptism. The original sense of the word *baptidzo* is on the whole in their power. It corresponds with the idea of immerse much more than with the idea of sprinkling."

S. Curcellæus, the learned and celebrated theologian, and professor at Geneva and Amsterdam, who died in 1659, says :

"Baptism was by plunging the whole body into water. , Nor did the disciples that were sent out by Christ administer baptism afterward in any other way."—B. v., ch. ii.

D. Chamierus, a great writer on systematic divinity, professor at Montauban, who died in 1621, says :

"Immersion of the whole body was used from the beginning, which expresses the force of the word baptize, whence John baptized in a river. It was afterward changed into sprinkling, though it is uncertain when or by whom it commenced."—Panstrat, Cathol, tom. iv., L.v., ch. ii., sec. 6.

VENEMA.—"The word *baptidzin*, to baptize, is nowhere used in the Scriptures for sprinkling."—Inst. Hist. Eccl. Vet. and Nov. Test., tom. iii., sec. i. § 136.

H. ALTING.—“The word baptism properly signifies immersion; improperly, by a metonymy of the end, washing.”—Loc. Commun., pars 1, loc. xii.

This confirms our statement that secondary and figurative meanings are not proper meanings.

TURRETIN.—“The word baptism is of Greek origin, and is derived from the verb *bapto*, which signifies to dip, and to dye; *baptidzein*, to baptize, to dip into, to immerse.”—Ins. loc. xix., quæes. xi., sec. 4.

DR. REES.—“Gr. BAPTO *et* BAPTIDZO *mergo et mergito*. Voss. Etym. To dip or merge frequently, to sink, to plunge, to immerse.” “The word baptism is derived from the Greek *baptidzo*, and means literally dipping or immersion.”—Ency.’ Art. Bap.

WITSIUS.—“It cannot be denied, that the native signification of the words *baptein* and *baptidzein* is to plunge, to dip.”—Econ. Fœd. l. iv., c. xvi. sec. 13.

“It is certain that both John the Baptist, and the disciples of Christ, ordinarily practiced immersion.—Econ. of the Cov., b. iv., c. xvi., § 13.

Eld. Ditzler can deny, though he can offer no proof of it.

J. G. Altman [1697–1758), a Swiss historian and divine, also professor of moral philosophy and Greek at Berne, says:

“In the primitive church persons to be baptized were not sprinkled, but entirely immersed in water, which was performed according to the example of John the Baptist.”—On 1 Cor. xv. 29, sec. 8.

Dr. L. Coleman, S. F. D., born in 1796, a noted scholar and standard church historian, says:

“The term baptism is derived from the Greek *baptidzo*, with its derivatives *baptismos* and *baptisma*, baptism. The primary signification of the original is, to dip, to plunge, immerse. The obvious import of the noun is immersion.”—Christian Antiquities, p. 255.

J. F. STAPPER. “By baptism we understand that rite of the New Testament church commanded by Christ, in which believers, by being immersed in water, testify their communion with the church.”—Instit. Theol. Polem. tom. i, cap. iii, sec. 1635.

Jacques Saurin (1677–1730), a noted French preacher, and author of twelve volumes of sermons and various other treatises, says:

“Paul says, ‘We are buried with him by baptism into death;’ that is the ceremony of wholly immersing us in water when we were baptized.”—Sermons, vol. iii, p. 171.

Theodore Beza (1529–1605) an eminent reformer, Greek and theological professor, and on the death of Calvin, took his place and became the head of the Presbyterian church, says:

"But *baptidzo* signifies to dip, since it came from *bapto*, and since things to be dyed are immersed."—On Matt. iii, 13.

He admits that some have disputed respecting immersing the whole body in the ceremony of baptism, but he maintains that "there is no other signification of the verb *amad*, which the Syrians use for baptize." "It answers," says he, "to the Hebrew *tabal* rather than *rachatz*." (*Ibid*). Elsewhere he says: "Christ commanded us to be baptized, by which word it is certain immersion is signified. Neither does the word *baptidzo* signify to wash, except by consequence, for it properly signifies to plunge into for the sake of tinging or dyeing."—Lec. 2d to T. T.

DR. M'CRIE.—"We do not hold that the word baptize signifies to pour or sprinkle. This was never our opinion."—On Bap., p. 32.

Summary.

MR. PRESIDENT:—Having brought in all the direct proof in support of the *usus loquendi* of the verb *baptidzo*, that my time will admit, I will now sum up my argument as briefly as possible.

The proposition I set out to prove is,

IMMERSION IS THE ACT WHICH CHRIST COMMANDED FOR CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

My opponent denies it.

Now this was the one argument which I laid down by which to prove it:

1. THE VERB BAPTIDZO IS THE ONLY VERB WHICH CHRIST USED IN THE COMMISSION TO DENOTE THE ACT WHICH HE COMMANDED FOR CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

2. THE PRIMARY AND LITERAL MEANING OF BAPTIDZO—WHICH IS THE ONLY REAL AND TRUE MEANING—IS "TO IMMERSE."

3. ERGO,

TO IMMERSE IS THE ONLY ACT WHICH CHRIST COMMANDED FOR CHRISTIAN BAPTISM, SINCE IT MUST BE GRANTED THAT IN ENACTING A LAW, ALL TERMS MUST BE USED IN THEIR LITERAL, REAL, AND MOST OBVIOUS MEANINGS.

The minor premise being admitted by both parties, the single issue to be settled is the major, *i. e.*,

Is to immerse, the primary, the literal and real signification of the Greek verb *baptidzo* ?

As it is conceded by all standard authorities that the *use* of any term by those with whom the language is vernacular, and by those who were conversant with the language, is the supreme and ultimate authority in determining its meaning, I first appealed to the New Testament for its invariable use by the inspired evangelists and apostles, who could not err.

1. *I first showed that John the Baptist, the first gospel minister of the New Testament dispensation, used baptidzo and the nouns derived from it in no other case than "to immerse," and immersion.*

2. I showed that the symbolism of the act, as taught by Christ, was a prefiguration of His own death, burial and resurrection, a fulfillment of the "all-righteousness" He came to fulfill, or accomplish, to secure the remission of the sins of His people; also,

3. That Christ metaphorically spoke of His own overwhelming sufferings as a baptism, alluding thus to His own at the hands of John.

4. That Paul, Rom. vi, 3, and Col. ii, 12, alluding to the act which Christ received in the river Jordan, calls it a "*burying*," a "*planting*," in the likeness of death.

I therefore concluded that Christ and his apostles, and all whom John baptized, were *immersed in water*. In support of this conclusion I brought forward the testimony of all the most eminent Pedobaptist scholars, commentators and critics.

Immersion in water then was the only act which Christ commanded His first minister to perform.

Immersion in water was the act which He Himself received, as our law-giver and exemplar.

Immersion, then, was the only act which the apostles and all the disciples of Christ, the members of the first Christian church on earth received prior to the ascension of Christ.

For it is on record that Christ's disciples made and baptized more disciples than John, and no one will deny that they administered the act which they and their Master had received.

IV My fourth argument was from the commission itself—

Christ used the same verb, *baptidzo*, and there is no shadow of intimation that there was to be any change in the act itself, which, according to every principle of law and reason, there should have been had he designed to change the physical act of the rite, or his apostles would inevitably have fallen into error. But he only extended a former commission given them, no longer limiting their ministry to Palestine, but extending it to the ends of the earth.

I reasonably concluded that Christ in the commission only authorized His apostles to administer the self-same act which He appointed from the first, and which He and they had received at the hands of John, which was an immersion in water.

V. Then from the very internal construction of the language of the commission, I showed that the act commanded must have been immersion alone.

The subjects *autous*, of the act being the *direct* accusative of the verb *baptidzo* forbids the idea that some element, as water, was to be put upon them, since a preposition must be supplied, or the language be made figurative, neither of which is admissible; but that the subjects were to be put bodily into it.

I showed from the very signification of the verbs to sprinkle and to pour, which is to scatter into drops, disperse into fine particles, or to diffuse in a continuous stream, that *literally* they could not take indivisible or inseparable objects as *direct* accusatives, but must take liquids, as water, etc., or separable solids, as sand, ashes, etc. If Christ had intended the element, water, to be put upon the subjects of baptism, He would have made *it* the direct accusative of the verb indicating the act, and have used the preposition on, or upon, before the subjects. Had He intended the subjects to be placed within the element, He would have placed them as the direct accusative of the verb. This He did do, and therefore we are compelled to conclude that this He intended.

Then again. Since it is impossible to sprinkle, scatter into drops or particles, or to pour, diffuse in a continuous stream, human beings without destroying life, therefore it is evident the verb *baptidzo* Christ used can have no such signification.

MY FIFTH ARGUMENT I WILL STATE IN THESE WORDS: YOU CANNOT SPRINKLE OR POUR LIVING BEINGS, BUT ONLY WATER, ETC., UPON THEM, THEREFORE CHRIST DID NOT COMMAND THEM TO BE SPRINKLED OR POURED.

VI. My sixth argument was from the invariable adaptation of the definitions to immerse and immersion in every passage in the New Testament where *baptidzo* or its noun *baptisma* is used.

By substituting no other word, can the sense of every passage be preserved, and this I regard as evidence demonstrative that *baptidzo* literally signifies only to immerse.

VII. My seventh argument was,

The apostles to whom the commission was given evidently understood Christ to mean immersion only as the sense of *baptidzo*.

In all their ministry they evidently observed no other act. In all their allusions to the action of baptism, immersion is clearly intended, *and no other act will fulfill the symbolism of baptism as set forth in their writings*, so that we may say of them all as Coneybeare and Howson say of Rom. vi, 3, "It cannot be understood unless it be borne in mind that the primitive baptism was by immersion.

This fact alone I regard as demonstrative and conclusive that the real signification of *baptidzo* is to immerse.

VIII. My eighth source of proof was,

The invariable use of the term by Greek authors themselves.

It is an admitted fact, by all scholars, that no Greek author has yet been found that uses *baptidzo* in a *physical* sense to signify, either "to sprinkle," or "to pour," but always "to immerse," "to dip," etc., and that wherever they use it *figuratively* the sense of the figure involves the idea of an immersion. It is known to all that I repeatedly called upon my opponent to bring forward, or give an authoritative quotation from *any* Greek author who used *baptidzo* in a physical sense to mean "sprinkle," and he has been unable to do so.

He claims that *baptidzo* never meant to immerse before the time of Polybius—but I have given you its use in that sense

by Aristotle, who lived 180 years before Polybius, and I have called upon him for one authority to support his assertion that *baptidzo* ever meant to sprinkle, and he has not furnished it.

IX. My ninth source of proof has been the lexicons. I have brought forward the united testimony of forty lexicons, among these *all that are regarded as standard authorities* in Europe and America, and one and all, each and several, give "to dip," or "to immerse," as the *primary*—*i. e.* the literal and *real* signification of *baptidzo*. To divert your attention from this stern, crushing and conclusive fact, my opponent has spent a full day in talking to you about a new discovery in philology, according to which the true primary is the *historical*, etc., which all scholars will laugh at as fanciful and absurd. To save needless controversy, at the very outstart I presented Rules of Interpretation, selected from the best authorities, and these Rules were mutually accepted by us. By virtue of the first three of those Rules, what we were to understand in this debate as the primary and literal sense of any term, is clearly determined.

Rules of Interpretation.

I. *Every word must have some specific idea, or notion, which we call meaning.*

Were not this so, words would be meaningless and useless.

II. The *literal*, which is also called the *grammatical* sense of a word, is *the sense* so connected with it that it is first in order, and is spontaneously presented to the mind as soon as the sound is heard. This meaning is always, placed first in the lexicons, and is known as *the primary* meaning.

III. "The primary or literal meaning is *the only true one*."—Ernesti, p. 14.

Ernesti quotes Morus in support of this: "There can be no certainty at all in respect to the interpretation of any passage, unless a kind of necessity compels us to affix a particular sense to a word; which sense, as I have before said, must be *one*; and unless there are special reasons for a *tropical* (or secondary) meaning, it must be the literal sense."

Stuart says: "If any one should deny that the above principles lead to certainty when strictly observed, would deny the possibility of finding the meaning of language with certainty."

Now by these rules I have been strictly governed, and these, every University and Theological Seminary in Europe and America will endorse.

I have sought throughout this discussion the true, and the *real*, the literal signification of *baptidzo*, and have, therefore, in reading from the lexicons, as a general rule, read only the strictly *primary* meanings, the first one, two or three given. IN ALL CASES ONLY ONE, AND THAT THE FIRST, WOULD HAVE BEEN SUFFICIENT! In every case I have faithfully and fully given the primary sense of the lexicon. I have shown that *no figurative*, which is always the *secondary*, sense of a term, is its real and physical sense, and is, therefore, not a real or literal signification, and with such we have nothing to do in this debate. I have explained how that, in strictest truth, Baptists may say with Carson and Anthon, that

“NO STANDARD LEXICON IN THE WORLD GIVES ‘TO SPRINKLE,’ OR ‘TO POUR,’ AS A LITERAL AND REAL SIGNIFICATION OF BAPTIDZO.”

I have in almost every speech not only most affectionately invited, but urgently called upon, demanded or challenged my opponent to produce one Greek lexicon of acknowledged authority, or an authoritative quotation from one, that gives “to sprinkle,” or “to pour,” as a primary meaning of *baptidzo*. HE HAS NOT DONE IT! His failure to do so should be considered as conclusive evidence to all that to immerse, etc., is the only signification of *baptidzo*.

Every semblance of an argument made by him has been founded upon the figurative significations of *baptidzo*, or, that by some author or in some version, a word is used for *baptidzo* that elsewhere is used in the sense of “to wet,” or “to sprinkle!!”

And this reminds me of the distinction Eld. Ditzler has endeavored to fix in your minds.

1. That while he admits that to immerse is the classic use of *baptidzo*, it is not its meaning in the New Testament Greek, but to wash, to cleanse in any way. This claim I have shown to be utterly groundless, in my speech on that subject to which all are referred—Dr. De Meyer emphatically says, and with him agree all the best scholars, such as Chalmers, Dr. Lange, Coneybeare and Howson, “*baptidzo*, which word in classic

Greek, AND IN THE NEW TESTAMENT EVERYWHERE means to immerse.”—Com. on Mark vii, 4.

It is not true, that any standard lexicon distinguishes between classic Greek and New Testament Greek in giving definitions of *baptidzo*—i. e., that it means one thing in classic Greek, and something different in the New Testament.

2. Then he has tried to make a show of an argument from the comparatively few times Baptists use “to dip,” for *baptidzo*, rendering it as they do almost invariably *to immerse*. There is not enough to make a shade in this fact. All lexicons give to dip, and to immerse, *as synonymous terms*, as the Germans give *mergo, immergo* and *tingo, intingo* as synonyms of *baptidzo*, and we are at liberty to use the most *euphonious* one, and Baptist authors generally have selected immerse—for its smoothness and euphony. Let it therefore be borne in mind, that wherever a lexicon gives to immerse, it means also to dip, and that of the forty I have read here, *the majority give to dip as the first of the synonyms for the primary signification*, and *never* to wet or moisten, much less to sprinkle.

X. My tenth argument, and one upon which I am willing to rest this whole controversy, is embraced in the last, but to make salient, I place by itself:

In 1846 Liddell & Scott, of England, upon the basis of Passow, brought out their great English lexicon, which has been endorsed by the scholars of both continents as the best Greek and English lexicon extant. In their first edition, as a seventh meaning of *baptidzo*, figurative of course, they give “to pour upon.” Prof. Drisler, of Columbia College, undertakes an American edition. Before he gets the last pages of his work through the press, Liddell & Scott issue in England a second edition, and because satisfied that “to pour upon” is not sustained by classical or New Testament usage, they omit it as well as “to drench.” Prof. Drisler, in his second American edition, does likewise. In the last edition of this last and greatest of all the Greek lexicons published in the English language, only “to dip in or under water,” of ships, “to sink them,” is given as the primary meaning of *baptidzo*.

But he has sought to belittle the great work of Liddell and

Scott, as "a small affair," "made for school boys," etc. I will once more put it upon record, that by general consent of scholars this lexicon is accounted *the very best* English work ever published, as Rost and Palm's is accounted the very best German lexicon. These lexicographers had all the results of the labors and discoveries in philology of all the scholars and lexicographers who preceded them, and into their works they gather all that can be regarded as authoritative and trustworthy. Into these lexicons we may safely look for the correct significations of Greek words—and what does each give as the literal and primary meaning of *baptidzo*, but to dip in or under water? This and nothing more. Rost and Palm give "often and frequently," following Passow as Liddell & Scott did in their first edition, but which they omit in their last as unwarranted, to which all scholars now consent. Then the last, greatest and best of all English lexicons, gives to dip, "in or under" as the only real literal meaning of *baptidzo*.

Now, you can clearly see that here is a final answer to his claim that, as figurative meanings often become their *primary*—and this very statement destroys his theory of historical primary—so the *figurative* meanings of *baptidzo*—*i. e.* to wet, moisten in any way, and hence to sprinkle—have now become the primary and present meaning of *baptidzo*. If this was the case, why do not Liddell and Scott, and Rost and Palm give these meanings as the primary in their late lexicons, but they equally deny them to be real meanings of *baptidzo*, as do all the lexicographers who have gone before them.

But he claims that the modern Greek lexicons sustain him! I have shown that not one sustains him. Let me sum them up for a separate argument.

Sophocles. (standard) *Baptidzo*, to dip, to immerse: sink, to be drowned as the effect of sinking.

Kouma. To sink, to put frequently into water.

Gazes. *Baptidzo*, mid so (*bapto*) *suchna bouto ti mesa eis to kai èntreuthen ana ton.* To dip a thing frequently into something and thence up *ana ton* in respect to it—that is, up to the surface—if *ana* was here used to govern the accusative—signify *upon*, the pronoun *ton* would have been *en*.

With their figurative and secondary meanings I have nothing to do—what has to pump or to draw water to do with set-

ting this question. He may say that the water is drawn "that it may be *poured* forth;" and I say that what may be done with the water after it is drawn has nothing to do with the definition of the verb—nor with the act of drawing. Water has been drawn, that it might be drunk—and is "to drink" therefore a proper definition of *baptidzo*, or to pump or draw water!

My opponent has affirmed that *baptidzo* never was used in the sense of immerse before the days of Polybius, etc.

But these forty lexicons give the meaning of *baptidzo*, in every age since the Greek has been a settled language and not one of them, neither the oldest nor the latest, even so much as intimates that *baptidzo* ever had any other meaning primarily—than *to dip*—and I have shown you that Aristotle one hundred and eighty years before Polybius used it in the sense of to immerse.

Now thirty full years have passed since Liddell and Scott, with the eyes of the scholars of Germany, England, and America upon them, with their knowledge and approval, made this change in their lexicon, and for no other reason except that they could not find a standard Greek author who used *baptidzo* in the sense of to pour upon, or to drench, even *figuratively*, and no scholar of earth could then help them to the authority. Thirty years of investigation and research have passed, and all the Pedobaptist scholars of Germany, England and America have not been able to furnish them any authority to justify "to pour upon," or to sprinkle, as even a proper figurative signification of *baptidzo*! Should not this fact settle this question in the mind of every candid man and Christian in the world? How supremely ridiculous for a man who never read as many consecutive lines in one book of classic Greek as these scholars have read Greek authors, to stand up in the hearing of the world and assert that *baptidzo*, primarily, *never* means to dip, to immerse, but means to sprinkle, "to pour!" Such a man is not talking to be regarded by scholars, he knows that he must forfeit all standing among them, but to the ignorant, with whom bold assertion accomplishes far more than argument.

XI. My eleventh source of proof was the testimony of the

Greek Fathers and Bishops, to whom Greek was vernacular and every one bore witness that *baptidzo*, naturally signified only to immerse, and that immersion was the sole and universal practice of the apostolic churches, and to this I added the invariable practice of the Greek church from the fourth century until now.

XII. My twelfth argument was from the testimony of all the Latin Fathers, from Tertullian downward, and they one and all understood *baptidzo* to signify *mergo, immergo, tingo, and intingo*, to sink in, to immerse, to dip, to dip in, and that immersion was the universal practice of the primitive churches, and to this I added the uniform practice of the Latin or Roman Catholic church for 1300 years, except in cases of necessity, when sprinkling was allowed, which was finally established by law by Pope Stephens at Arles A. D. 754.

XIII. My thirteenth source of proof was the Versions of the Old and New Testaments.

(1). The first Greek version of the Old Testament was made in the third century before Christ by seventy learned Jews. They rendered the verb *taval*, the word which as invariably in Hebrew means to immerse as *to dip* does in English—by *baptidzo*, save in one instance, where they translate it figuratively “to dye.”

(2.) In the Syriac-Peschito, which, until the appearance of the Curetonian text, was regarded the oldest version of the New Testament, translates *baptidzo* and its derivatives invariably by the verb *amad* and its derivatives; and *amad* in Syriac, as all standard lexicographers testify, primarily signifies to immerse. I have put it in proof that the Syrian Christians from the first century have *immersed*. I have put it in proof that at Edessa, where was their most ancient, their mother church, a large house called *maaduthito*, baptistery, was erected for the purpose of immersion. I have said nothing in this discussion contradictory of what I wrote in my Edition of Stuart on Baptism, which any one by comparing me can see, but I have, for the honor of the Holy Spirit, opposed the claims of the Syriac version as equal with the inspired text, which my opponent has put up for it, which I regard as little less than profane!

God's word with me is *above* all that has been written. It is indeed an ancient version, but made by uninspired and therefore fallible men, and scarce to be *compared* with the inspired text; but all its testimony is in support of immersion as the only act of Christian baptism, as is the practice of the Syrian churches from the beginning until now.

And this I have shown with respect to every version of the New Testament made, whether in the Orient or the Occident, ancient or modern, wherever the word has been *translated*, a native word being invariably used that signifies to immerse.

XIV My fourteenth argument in proof is:

The testimony of all the historians of the Eastern or Greek Church.

They all say that immersion was the primitive practice.

XV *My fifteenth is the united voice of all the historians of the Latin or Roman Catholic Church.*

XVI. *My sixteenth is the unbroken testimony of the historians of the Church of England without an exception.*

XVII. *My seventeenth is the united testimony of all the historians of the Lutheran Church.*

XVIII. *My eighteenth is the accordant testimony of all the historians of the Presbyterian Church.*

XIX. *My nineteenth is the testimony of all the historians of the Methodist Church, as well as of all historians endorsed by that communion.*

XX. *The testimony of all the historians of the Congregational Church.*

There is the utmost accord among all these that immersion was the only act of apostolic and primitive baptism.

Can it be that these, one and all, are unreliable? Can it be that the unsupported assertions of *one* man will outweigh critical statements of full one hundred of the most eminent pedobaptist scholars and all the historians of seven different denominations?

XXI. My twenty-first argument in proof is the conjoint testimony of the Fathers of the Reformation, and of Methodism itself, Calvin, Zuingli, Luther, and Wesley.

These four unitedly bear the same testimony that the radical

and natural signification of *baptidzo* is to immerse, and that immersion was the practice of the first churches. Will Methodists suffer the authority of their father and founder to be ranked as inferior to the bare word of a modern traveling preacher? Will Presbyterians admit that the authority of my opponent is superior to that of their great Calvin, who was indeed the first scholar of his age?

XXII. MY TWENTY-SECOND ARGUMENT IN PROOF IS THE ADMISSION OF TWENTY-THREE OF THE MOST EMINENT PEDOBAPTIST SCHOLARS, COMMENTATORS AND CRITICS.

These extend over a period of three hundred consecutive years, embracing the ripest scholarship of every century, including the first. Must the united testimony of all these weigh light as air, when counterpoised by the bare words of one man?

XX. FINALLY, I HAVE PRESENTED THE CONJOINT TESTIMONY OF TEN STANDARD CYCLOPEDIAS.

These are neither denominational nor partizan, but national in their character, establishing the fact that immersion was the only apostolic and primitive act.

In view of all these irrefragible proofs, I conclude in the language of Moses Stuart, one of the very first Pedobaptist scholars of his age;

"*Bapto* and *baptidzo* mean to dip, plunge, or immerse into any liquid. All lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed on this." "It is," says Augusti (*Denku*. vii., p., 216), 'a thing made out,' viz., the ancient practice of immersion. So indeed all the writers who have thoroughly investigated the subject conclude. I know of no usage of ancient times which seems to be more clearly made out. I CANNOT SEE HOW IT IS POSSIBLE FOR ANY CANDID MAN WHO EXAMINES THE SUBJECT TO DENY THIS."—pp. 51, 149, 150.

I therefore, Mr. President, feel justified in saying that I have established my major premise above all question or controversy—i. e., that the primary, literal and real signification of *baptidzo* is "to immerse," and only "to immerse."

Ergo,

I feel that I am justified in saying that my conclusion is logical and invincible—

IMMERSION WAS THE ACT WHICH CHRIST COMMANDED FOR CHRISTIAN BAPTISM. Q. E. D.

Mr. President, the additional time allowed to me in closing my argument, you will grant to my opponent, if he desires it.

DR. DITZLER'S NINETEENTH REPLY

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—As to those authorities, we have offset them over and again. I. As to Encyclopedias, you will notice :

1. How completely each new one substantially copies the former. Hence it is quite as *one*.

2. The main ones simply *copy* Wall, an *avowed* immersionist, and one who never examined into this question with anything like critical research, but spent his time on the historic arguments on infant baptism. Yet he proved affusion to be Scriptural.

3. Men are hired to write the separate articles for Encyclopedias, and immersionists wrote these articles, following Wall, mainly, whose preference for dipping he openly avowed.

4. They are mainly treating of it as it existed in days subsequent to the apostles. By *primitive* church, they mean the earliest centuries, *contrasting* them with the "apostolic church." It is well known that such old Episcopal and Catholic writers look on what occurred in the second, third, and first part of the fourth century, as quite of equal authority as if occurring in apostolic times. Hence the boldness of their deductions as to what was done in Christ's time. We demand *proof in all* these matters. Hence :

5. These authorities had not *one-tenth* of the *light* and *facts* on this subject that we to-day have. The Baptists have proclaimed and published it to the world that the most eminent of the scholars of the first half of the century Wall lived in, gave us TWENTY THOUSAND (20,000) errors in the version they gave us. Hence the opinion of such men is not to be taken as *infallible* by any means.

II. As to the authorities he quotes, we will first notice a few of them, then offset with far superior—almost infinitely

superior scholars and critics, both of a former age, and of the present.

1. Take Mosheim, for the historians, as he is the boldest. *What proof* does he adduce to support his bold words? *On* quotation only—Vossius. But Vossius, living in the seventeenth century, is too late to tell us anything we do not know. In the next place, Vossius held that affusion was practiced in the apostolic day, just as Witsius, Terretinus, Suicer, etc. held, and gave "*adspergere*," sprinkle, as a New Testament meaning of *baptidzo*. Hence Mosheim's partiality for immersion, though a Pedobaptist, led him to suppress, and do injustice to the testimony of Vossius. A great number of the authors Dr. Graves quotes, are so little known, so little read and of such inferior standing, we need not quote but a few and they shall be the greatest of critics—most of them of this age.

HISTORIANS AND CRITICS.

1. As you all say lexicographers are to be tested by the *original authorities* whence *they* derived their information, so we demand now, especially when all historians are now required in foot notes, to give the authorities they rely on for statements. This is just. Hence, when Mosheim, Neander, etc. state a point, we have access to ALL THEY HAD, AND A VAST DEAL MORE. They never saw *Hippolytus* when they wrote, e. g.

Mosheim and *Neander* etc., rely mainly on *Tertullian*—we have seen *his* testimony.

1. ALFORD.—On Mark vii. 4, 8: "The *baptismoi*, as applied to *kline* (couches at meals) were certainly *not immersions*, but *sprinklings* or *affusions* of water." Luke xi. 38: "Did not imply necessarily immersion of the whole body."

Acts ii. 41, vol. ii. 25: "Almost without doubt, this first baptism must have been administered, as that of the first Gentile converts was (see ch. x. 47, and note), by affusion, or *sprinkling*, not by immersion.." (Italic His.)

2. BEZA is thus quoted by Dr. Judd, Review of M. Stuart Apen. to Dr. Graves's publication, p. 249. "Beza, after remarking that *baptidzo* properly means to *immerse*, and never to *wash*, except AS A CONSEQUENCE of *immerse*, says Nec alia

est, etc.—nor does the signification of *amad* which the Syrians use for baptize, differ at all from this.—See Beza Annot. in Marc. vii. 4.”

M. STUART shows that there *baptidzo* means “to wash, cleanse by water.” “*Bapto*—to moisten, wet, bedew.” He says the cases in Daniel iv. and v., “make it plain that the word *bapto* was occasionally used to designate the application of liquid or moisture to the surface of anything, in any way whatever; whether of washing, or by gentle affusion of the dew. The example of Judith shows very clearly that *washing* of the person may be designated by *baptidzo*; for into the fountain, in the midst of the camp, it is not probable that she plunged.” “We have also seen, in Nos. 2, 5, 6, of Examples from the Septuagint and Apocrypha, that the word *baptidzo* sometimes means to wash; and *bapto* to moisten, to wet, or bedew. There is, then, no absolute certainty from usage, that the word *baptidzo*, when applied to designate the rite of baptism, means of course to immerse or plunge.” “Both the classic use and that of the Septuagint show that *washing* and *copious affusion* are sometimes signified by the word.”—Bib. Ref., vol. i. 1833, p. 313.

He then urges that Acts ii. 41, ix. x. 43–37; Acts xvi. 14, 16, 32, 33, etc., were all by affusion—on Pentecost 3000, the 5000, the Jailor, Paul, Lydia, etc.

Moses Stuart further says: “These are all the examples of *bapto* or *baptidzo* which can be found in the Septuagint or Apocrypha.” From these the reader will easily see, that some of the classical meanings of these are not to be found in the books aforesaid; whilst other meanings, viz., *to wash*, *to bedew*, or *moisten*, are more clearly and fully exhibited.” Page 69. His result is: “We do obey the command to baptize, when we do it by affusion or sprinkling.” Page 195.

BAUMGARTEN.—“The baptism of Saul followed immediately the receiving of his sight, is baptized by means of the water poured upon him.”—Com. on Acts ix. 1, 36, vol. i., p. 238–9.

“With a part of the same water [used in washing their stripes], the keeper of the prison and all his were baptized * * without the dipping of the whole body, in the open running water.”—Vol. ii. 134.

OLSHAUSEN, On John iii. 25–27: “The dispute related to baptism—*katha-*

rimos [purification] equivalent to *baptisma*." This was always by sprinkling. See John ii. 6; Heb. ix. 13; Mark vii. 4. "Ablutions of all sorts * * *baptismos* is here, as in Hebrews ix. 10, ablution, washing generally." He considers that in Acts ii. 41, the 3000 were baptized by "sprinkling."

BENGEL.—"Immersion in baptism, or at least the sprinkling of water upon the person," etc.

FAIRBAIRN.—"The 'diverse' evidently points to the several uses of water, such as we know to have actually existed under the law, *sprinklings, washings, bathings*."—Hermet, Manual, Art, *baptidzo*.

BLOOMFIELD, on Mark vii. 4: "Washing of the hands before mentioned, in which, however, is not implied immersion." Acts viii. 38: "Philip seems to have taken up water with his hands and poured it copiously on the Eunuch's head."

GEO. HILL.—"Both sprinkling and immersion are implied in the word *baptidzo*."—Lect. on Div. 659.

A. CLAKE.—"Were the people dipped or sprinkled? for it is certain *bapto* and *baptidzo* mean both."—On Matt. iii. 6.

J. WESLEY.—"The Greek word [for baptize] means indifferently either washing or sprinkling."—Notes on Mark vii. 7.

STEIR considers that on Pentecost they were baptized by sprinkling. *Leben Jesu*.

ARCHBISHOP KENDRICK, Catholic, so often misrepresented, says, quoting Augustine's words: "Unless wheat be ground, and sprinkled with water, it cannot come to that form which is called bread. So you, also, were first ground as it were by mystic exorcisms. Then was added baptism: ye were as it were *sprinkled*, that ye might come to the form of bread."* On this Kendrick says: "St. Augustine remarks * * sprinkled with water [quoting the above]. In like manner [again quoting the above]. This being addressed generally to the faithful, most of whom were solemnly baptized, leads us to infer that even in solemn baptism, aspersion was often used, water being sprinkled on the candidate while he stood deeply immersed."†

On Hebrews ix. 10, Archbp. Kendrick again says: "St. Paul calls the various ablutions of the old law, many of which were by aspersion, *divers* baptisms. * * Thus it appears manifest that the term was in his time, used indiscriminately for all kinds of ablution."—188

DODDRIDGE.—"Hebrews ix. 10, and in different baptisms or washings, either of the whole body or a part of it in water, as different occasions demanded." "I see no proof that it (immersion) was essential to the institution."—Com. in loc. and Acts viii. 38.

On Acts viii. 38, he supposes Philip poured the water on him.

Sermon CC' xxviii., ad Inf. de Sacram. 1417.

† K. on Bap. 156, Ed. 1852.

CARPZOO, *Issagoge*, p. 1085: "Baptism is a Greek word, and in itself means a washing, in whatever way performed, whether by immersion in water, or by aspersion. * * It is not restricted to immersion or aspersion; hence it has been a matter of indifference from the beginning whether to administer baptism by immersion or by pouring of water."—Page 330.

GERHARD, of whom the great Tholuck says: "The most learned, and with the learned, the most beloved among the heroes of Lutheran orthodoxy," says: "Whether a man is baptized by immersion into water, or by sprinkling, or applying the water to him, it is the same."—*Loc. Theol.* ix. 137.

REINHARD.—"Earthly or perceptible, pure natural water in which a person is immersed, or with which he is partially sprinkled, is the baptism instituted by Christ."—*Dogmat.* 570, 572 also.

LIGHTFOOT.—"The word, therefore, *baptismous* (washings), applied to all these [people, vessels, beds, Mark vii. 4,] properly, and strictly, is not to be taken of *dipping* or *plunging* [*italics his*], but, in respect of some things, of washing only, and, in respect of others, of *sprinkling* only."—*Horæ Heb. et Gal.* ii. 419.

It is useless to pile up authorities that can be multiplied almost endlessly. Let it be remembered, we have selected the most eminent of their respective ages in the department of philology. Olshausen, Baumgarten, Alford, A. Clarke, Stier, Fairbairn, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Stuart, had no superiors—all belong to this century, and all, save one or two, to our age. *Not one is quoted from second hand.*

[The above is put in, as Dr. Graves and I agreed, neither of us having read our authors, of the above class, connectedly in debate].

We now have no time to notice little points, the debate is to be settled by the real facts in the case, the science of language, the laws of philology. To this all scholars are agreed. I can only give a few of my many points and facts in the short space of half an hour. Then we came to the Greek. Here

I. We appealed to the lexicons.

1. The Greek Lexicography was developed in the West—in England and France by Budæus, Stephanus, Scapula and Constantine—all immersionists—under immersion laws and practices, which continued in force, even for long years after this. Superstition added to the intensity of popular prejudice

in favor of immersion. *All* subsequent lexicons till Passow, Schneider's larger work, Rost and Palm, were only servile abridgments of Stephanus and Scapula, Scapula an abridgment of Stephanus. Hence all prejudice was on the side of immersion up to our age.

2. All this class of lexicons—the better ones—

(1). Give “merse, immerse” for the classic use and “overwhelm.”

(2). They never give “immerse” as a New Testament use at all—not one of them.

(3). They never give dip as either a classic or New Testament use. Dip came in under the later, loose definitions of the middle age of lexicography when the silly conceit took the brains of some that it was a *frequentative*, as Dr. Graves told us truly.

(4). They all give as its *only* New Testament use *abluo, lavo*—*abluo* is cleanse, *lavo* is wash, besprinkle.

This is the old, unscientific body of lexicons. They all support our practice—are against Dr. Graves.

3. Next came the mass of lexicons of the old school, now known as empirical, yet good, not scientific, but valuable. We produced a part of these, Schætzennius, Suicer, Stokius, Schleusner, etc., etc.,—an armed host. Every one of them gave either sprinkle, pour, sprinkle and pour, or a word equivalent to both. Here let us quote Stokius once more *in full* both on the noun where A. Campbell and Dr. Graves rely on him, then on the verb, and see if he contradicts himself or supports Dr. Graves. I take Dr. Graves's own rendering of it.

“BAPTISMA. 1. Generally, and by force of the original it denotes immersion or dipping. 2. Specially. *a.* Properly, it denotes the immersion or dipping of a thing in water, that it may be cleansed or washed. Hence, it is transferred to designate the first sacrament of the New Testament, which they call of initiation, namely baptism, in which those to be baptized were, formerly immersed into water; though at this time the water is only sprinkled upon them, that they may be cleansed from the pollution of sin, receive the remission of it, and be received into the covenant of grace, as heirs of eternal life.”

Note here—

1. No text of the *Bible* is given to support this—“*formerly* immersed.”

It was "formerly," in a day when they who did so held it to be that "they may be cleansed from the *pollution of sin*," and "which they call [the rite] of *initiation*." Yes, *exactly* so. Conant quotes scores of such places where they call it all of this, but it is *hundreds* of years *after* Christ in *every* case. It was when the jargon of the dark ages was developed.

3. When they by baptism professed to receive them "into the covenant of grace and heirs of eternal life." *Then* is when they *immersed* formerly as now they sprinkle. So says Stokius. But no Scripture can be adduced for this. It was simply "FORMERLY." Now let us have his *New Testament* use and definition.

Stokius, "BAPTIDZO, *lavo, baptidzo*, passive, *luoi, lavo*. I wash, I baptize. Passive, I am washed, cleansed." Here he cites New Testament texts. He then gives the classic use and his idea of its philology.

"Generally, and by the force of the verb, it obtains the sense of dipping or plunging. Specially, (*a*) properly it is to immerse in water. Tropically (1) by a *metalepsis*, it is to wash or cleanse, because anything is accustomed to be dipped or immersed in water that it may be washed or cleansed, although also the washing or cleansing can be, and *generally* is effected by SPRINKLING the water. Mark vii. 4; Luke xi. 38."

Hence it is translated sprinkle.

Here, then, we have the unanimous support of all these lexicons, while not one supports Dr. Graves's position.

4. Next come the native Greek lexicographers, Kouma and Gazes, who studied Greek classics also in Germany, and was distinguished with great honors for his erudition. He gives it "shed forth, sprinkle," "pour upon" (*epichuno*), "wash either the person or hands," while Kouma gives "besprinkle, shed forth"—(*brecho, katabrecho*). Euthymus, a learned Greek, translates *baptidzo rantidzo* sprinkle, in the 4th century. It is translated *rantidzo* sprinkle by two learned Greeks who copied the New Testament, about A. D. 331. It is translated sprinkle by eight others—all Greeks before the language died. Why this great flurry over Stokius doing so in the light of these facts? Why such writhing over Stokius doing so when the most learned men in Greek that ever lived or died in the church, Origen, a native Greek, who wrote 50 folio volumes in Greek,

born only 84 years after John's death, translated *bapto* by *raino* "Sprinkle," as well as Irenæus born before John died, and Hippolytus, all Greeks of great leaning of the second and third centuries? You say *bapto* and *baptidzo* are the same in meaning. Seven of the ancient, best and learned versions of antiquity do the same. They received the unaimous support of the whole church.

5. We then come to the more critical, scientific lexicons. While SCHNEIDER gives immerse as a classic meaning, he gives *brecho*, shed or pour fourth, sprinkle, as its *general* meaning. PASSOW gives "immerse, submerge" as classic meanings, as well as "wet, moisten, sprinkle, intoxicate," then says "GENERALLY, to sprinkle upon to pour upon, to overwhelm, etc."

ROST and PALM give "immerse, submerge, wet, moisten, sprinkle, etc., GENERALLY to sprinkle upon, to pour upon, overwhelm."

SWARZIUS gives "sprinkle, besprinkle, to pour upon." This will do as samples.

6. Not a lexicon on the green earth gives an earlier authority for immerse, dip or plunge than Polybius—a writer who comes in followed by Diodorus Siculus after the *great change* in the Greek language that Liddell and Scott, and all critics agree had come in.

7 These hosts of Greeks, Greek lexicons, earlier, later, all—UNANIMOUSLY support us and grind to death and dust our opponent.

II. Next we introduced the great leaders of immersion or dipping—Gale, Conant, Ingham, Carson, etc., etc., when writing avowedly to support what they practice from classic Greek. We take the result of their labors.

1. They tell us *baptidzo* is ALWAYS dip. "Wherever is *bap*, (the stem or root syllable) there is the dip." Pendleton renders it out of twenty-two cases "dip" only *once*. Gale out of twenty-one, dip three times. Fuller out of twenty-two has it dip *once*. Stuart, when giving all for that side possible, out of forty-one cases, *once* dip, three immerse. Dr. Carson out of thirty one cases has it dip *three* times only. Conant out of

sixty-three consecutives cases has it *dip*—NOT ONCE! Ingham out of *one hundred and sixty-nine cases has it dip*—JUST ONCE!! A. Cambell out of all his citations—though under *bapto* in *later* Greek he gives it dip a number of times—yet under *baptidzo* dip—NOT ONCE!!!

2. Now then, Dr. Graves abandons the universally admitted and well known fact that the primary meaning is the meaning the word had first affixed to it by the inventors of the word or language, and takes up *the general* meaning, the current one, *usus loquendi* as the *primary* one. Suppose we agree to this. It utterly destroys him.

3. Leigh, Passow, Schneider, Rost, Palm, Stokius, etc., tell us its general, its current use is sprinkle, pour upon.

Notice here. Stokius held as *all* scholars do, and as every tyro knows, that a tropical becomes—*often* becomes—*the literal* and *prevailing* meaning of a word *and it ceases to be a tropical* word to those who use it. All know this. We quoted Fowler, etc., on it. Hence Schleusner urges that 1. Wash, baptize, are THE New Testament meanings of *baptidzo*. Next he urges how it came to be so used. Then he urges that from dipping in water came wash—a false philology as we saw. Then to wash in any mode. Hence the washing was accustomed to be performed by sprinkling the water. When *this* became the habit and force of *baptidzo*, we see the Jews thus baptized *daily*. Mark vii, 4; Luke xi, 38. “Hence because *baptidzo* came to be thus practiced *altogether* by Jews, it is transferred to the sacrament of baptism,” and here follow a swarm of texts in the Gospels, Acts and Epistles. For the rest and for Schleusner, see p. 29, and speech 15. Stokius tells us “since anciently the water was copiously poured on those baptized,” it came metaphorically to be applied to pouring the Spirit on the people.

Thus you see Schleusner is wholly on our side. It is in vain dust is thrown to obscure these facts. Dr. Graves says it, Schleusner’s *opinion* is so and so! Is not every definition a man gives, *his* opinion of the matter? Hence the various ways in which they define words. What miserable dodges.

2. These Baptists show dip, immerse are THE RAREST OF ALL MEANINGS.

3. All demonstrate that it never meant immerse till Polybius. Hence from Dr. Graves's stand-point immersion is not a primary meaning, nor is dip a meaning at all. We demonstrated that it never meant to dip. From *every* stand-point it never primarily meant immerse.

4. We next gave the laws of science, of philology. Liddell and Scott, the present Introduction to Webster's Dictionary, all scholars agree, that philology, the scientific treatment of words to ascertain the primary meaning of words is a very *modern* science, all since Webster's day even. We have said for twenty years this subject never was treated from a proper, true stand-point. We produced an array of words that could be made indefinitely long, and it is *the universal* law of language that words develop from sprinkle to immerse as well as to dip, taking on all the meanings *bapto* and *baptizo* have, but *in no case* is it the reverse. When SCIENCE DEMONSTRATES a proposition, the opinions of even *ten thousand* opponents who spoke when there was *no* science in it, no laws laid down for finding any primary, amount to nothing. Men's opinions are only valuable as they have chances to *know* of what they affirm. But on it as far as they knew, all the greatest critics are on our side.

1. We gave full twenty-five words, have over fifty, that primarily mean to sprinkle, or, as a small proportion do, that mean to moisten, bedew, wet, where it is by affusion, oft of tears, juice of vines, sap; dew, rain, etc., that come to mean all that *bapto* and *baptizo* are admitted to mean by all parties. Hence the unexceptional and universal law of language is, from sprinkle to moisten, wet, stain, color, thence dye as in *bapto*; where coloring fluid is not an accident, it is sprinkle, (moisten, wet), pour, (of water), wash, drench, soak; from soak, drench, comes, make drunk, intoxicate; from pour, of (water, rain,) comes overwhelm, overflow, inundate. From overwhelm, oppressed with overwhelming elements, comes sink, (*immergo*, *submergo*), and from sink, sinking in water, etc., comes drown, perish. From pouring water by the power of its friction necessarily comes wash. Pouring water washes *per force*. It is God's general cleanser of all the earth. Dew washes dust

and dirt off vegetables, flowers, etc., even as perspiration washes paint off the face. This we saw was the universal law of language.

2. We saw that no word in Hebrew, Chaldee, Arabic, Syriac, Ethiopic, Greek, Latin, German, Spanish, English, that properly or primarily meant dip or immerse, ever meant what all admit *bapto* and *baptidzo* so often mean. It is absurd to presume that these two important words violate all known laws of language, all principles of philology, and all admitted facts of history with not one word of reason or fact either to demand the acceptance of universal absurdity.

(1). Wash, we saw, is a derived meaning of *baptidzo*, and of hosts of words primarily implying sprinkle. It is never a derived meaning of immerse in any language of earth. Hence as it is derived from *baptidzo*, yet never from immerse, immerse never was a primary meaning of the word.

(2). Intoxicate often is a derived meaning of words primarily meaning to sprinkle, to moisten, where it is with dew, rain, tears, but never from immerse or dip as a primary. But intoxicate is a derived meaning of *baptidzo*. Hence immerse never was a primary meaning of *baptidzo*.

(3). Overflow is a derived meaning of *baptidzo*. It never is of immerse or dip. Hence immerse, dip, never were primary meanings of *baptidzo*. Words primarily meaning sprinkle, pour, often mean to overflow.

(4). Overwhelm is a constantly recurring meaning of *baptidzo* as a derivative. It never is derived from dip or immerse. Hence dip, immerse, never were primary meanings of *baptidzo*. But overwhelm, whelm and overflow are constantly derived from words meaning to sprinkle, to pour—a pouring rain causes all these. Hence all facts, all philology, demonstrate sprinkle as the primary meaning of the word.

(5). We then took up the classics in Greek and showed

1. No lexicon gave immerse as a meaning earlier than Polybius, Diodorus Siculus, Strabo, Josephus, and Plutarch—all late in the iron age of Greek.

2. No Greek used it for immerse earlier than these.

3. All the earliest occurrences for centuries were cases (1) of metaphorical use only. (2) All in the sense of sprinkle and pour—not one dip, not one immerse. Pindar, Aristophanes, Alcibiades, Demosthenes, all use it for asperse, pour torrents of abuse upon people. Plato three times to intoxicate, once to confuse with questions. Aristotle, the first known to use it in a literal sense, makes it equivalent to *kutakludzo*, overflow, whose primary meaning is aspersion, insersion. Now, then, philology, on which immersionists heretofore have all relied so securely, as clearly demonstrates our position as Euclid ever demonstrated a mathematical problem. All the occurrences of the word in earlier Greek do the same. All facts confirm it. From these there is no appeal. Hence by the laws Dr. Graves laid down, no Baptist is baptized save the few who have gone from Pedobaptist churches. You are not baptized if we are to adhere to primary use or apostolic precedent.

(6). Dr. Graves then, seeing his cause swept away as with a flood, backed down squarely on primary. He gave up the ship on that great issue, their last hope in appealing from the general definitions given by lexicons. Nay, after spending his first full hour in giving us an outline and his philological laws, the moment he saw we cut him entirely off, he abandoned his line, fled from his entrenchments, and took the nearest cut he could for Jordan and Enon, and never paused at the drying up of Jordan till he was heard in the tombs, buried by baptism into death. Never was there such a precipitate flight from such costly and labored entrenchments.

(7). He appealed to the Hebrew *tabhal*, rendered baptize in the Seventy, used by the apostles and by the lexicons. We showed

1. That sprinkle was its primary meaning.

2. That twenty-four of the greatest Hebrew lexicographers of the world declared where "the object merely touched the water, (or liquid), in part or in whole," it baptized.

3. That the twenty-fifth, Rabbi Furst, the greatest Hebrew critic of the last ten centuries, showed its primary meaning was to besprinkle, in which the facts of the other twenty-four show

him to be correct, and all our laws of philology demonstrate it. It is vain, therefore, for Dr. Graves to seek to disparage this prince of science in Oriental philology, when all science, and all facts, and all scholarship unite in his support by their facts; or if Dr. Graves' position be true, all these, Buxtorff, Schindler, Castell, Pocock, Kimchi, Stokius, Leigh, etc., are all wrong, wholly wrong. If it implies immersion, then it is false to say it only implies a mere touch to the liquid, or to be touched by the water, (*ab aqua*). It could not be true that one could baptize with "the little particles of hail" gathered by one on a cold day. Nor could a man well immerse himself in one-fifth of a pint of water, as we saw they baptized with it.

(8). We showed that Origen, the most scholarly of all the church Fathers, born eighty-four years after John's death, says of the altar of stones and wood built on the mountain in the dry time of three year's drouth, an ox laid upon that, on which "four pitchers of water" were poured, not barrels, there were no barrels then, but pitchers of water, Origen says, "they baptized the altar." Basil says it was baptism. We quoted their words when we introduced it. Dr. Graves attempted no reply worth the name. He mainly ignored it.

We quoted the learned Greek Father of A. D. 190, Clemens Alexandrinus, who tells us of parties washing—one besprinkling herself with water before devotion, we quoted the Greek—and Clemens held this an image of Moses' baptism handed down by the poets, Homer, etc.—for "the Jews daily baptize upon a couch," that is, sitting at meal on couches, as they did in Christ's day. He has never even noticed this testimony so sweeping.

(9). We showed that *bapto*, the root word of *baptidzo*, that gave it its primary meaning, primarily meant to sprinkle, never to immerse; but it did mean in later Greek to dip, where it was partial, as a derived meaning from stain, color, as stain was a derivative of sprinkle. We showed that *bapto*, in earliest Greek, was used in the sense of sprinkle, pour. That all its other meanings could be accounted for on no other ground, applying the facts and laws of language as on *baptidzo*. Not

only Homer, Eschylus, Sophocles, Aristophanes, etc., the earliest Greek, use it for sprinkle, stain, where it is by pouring, touching, etc., but later, Origen, Irenæus, Hippolytus, the Syriac, Itala Ethiopic, and all the earliest versions, have translated it sprinkle. Dr. Graves never even referred to or noticed any of these facts.

(10). We exposed his views of Jordan, of Philip and the eunuch, baptism at Enon, etc., showing it did not involve immersion at all. We showed that *ek*, out of Jordan, "out of the water," (Ex. li. 10; Josh. iv. 16—21, etc.), *eis* to Jordan, *eis* towards the sea, *eis* at the Jordan, occurred often in the Greek, where all admit it involved no entrance into or *ek* emergence from, the water.

He appealed to Rom. vi. 3, 4, 5, and fought it desperately to hold the fort, as here was the Gibraltar of their views. But we showed that it was spiritual engrafting, as into Jesus Christ, that it was no allusion to water, or water baptism at all. So Beza, Hodge, Stuart held also. We then proved that baptized into Christ spiritually resulted in our spiritual incorporation with him, we die daily, are crucified with him, conformed to his death, which was by crucifixion; were "buried by the baptism" of the Spirit into his death, were planted, (Greek) born together, "engrafted together in the likeness of his death," which is spiritual crucifixion. That is not a dip under water. Hence, 2. Cor. iv. 10, 11, "we who live are always delivered *eis* into death" by being thus crucified or engrafted together in the likeness of his death. The word in the Greek is never modal, and never implies burial or immersion, the word rendered plant, while a man "was buried with the burial of an ass, drawn forth and cast beyond the gates of Jerusalem," Jer. xxii. 19, left to be eaten of dogs, no envelopment. Yet these two words were their only hope. We have followed the Doctor as closely as death its victim in every attempted argument, while he has really made no effort even to meet or offset the terrible array of facts, laws of language and authorities we have adduced against them.

(11). THE LAVER. This plain but telling argument, he has not dared to attempt to grapple with either. We quoted Lev.

xi. 30-37, xv. entire. You can read, Num. xix. 3-22, especially verses 13 and 22; xxxi. 23; viii. 7, making the greater part of the "diverse baptisms" of Heb. ix. 10, the mode given in verses 13, 19, 21 of the same chapter. These showed that for hundreds of things men became ceremonially unclean, and had to baptize every day from one to three or four times. We showed that for any uncleanness they had to baptize. Mark vii. 4-8; Luke xi. 38; Eccl. xxiv. 24, etc. We showed that the great Laver, Ex. xxx. 18-20; xl. 30-32, 2 Chron. iv. 2-10, was for the priests to wash (*ex anton*) *ek* out of it, not in it. That it was twenty-one feet high to keep its waters from being defiled by any unclean person or thing touching them. That it had apertures, cocks, at the base, even with a man's face in height, whence the water ran for washing "out of it." That daily, hourly, baptisms were here performed, I read the law: "Whatsoever the unclean person toucheth shall be unclean." Num. xix. 22, and much else to the same effect. See Lev. xv., xi. and xvi. entire. I read where Dr. Graves, A. Campbell, Gale, Carson, Ingham, etc., all hold this washing to be immersion, baptism. That the New Testament and Apocrypha apply *baptidzo* repeatedly to it. Immersion was impossible, because forbidden. They dared not even touch the water in it, but wash of it. Had one immersed in it, all its nearly one thousand barrells would have had to have been emptied out, itself cleansed by fire, Num. xxxi, 23, etc., and to have been filled before it could have been used. It required a leap twenty-one feet high to get into it. All the details we gave. The result was, at the smallest count, in the 1,500 years from Moses till the commission, 1,645,500,000,000 of baptisms among the Jews took place, baptism with water, all by affusion, not one by dipping. It was insisted that Jews had private cisterns, some two even, twenty-five to twenty-seven feet deep, twelve to sixteen feet in diameter, to hold plenty of water against dry seasons, etc. But by the laws read, personal cleansing in them would not be allowed. Immersing one person in one would defile all its waters, Lev. xi. 30-35, Num. xix. 22, etc., the vessel of wood must be emptied, rinsed, if earthenware, broken, if metallic, burned out and then sprinkled with water. All these facts show that

they did not immerse. Hence all the oldest Greek Bibles, (MSS), fourth century, in Mark vii. 4, read "sprinkle themselves" for those washings, because it was always simply a sprinkling, not even a pouring or heavier washing. Besides, who can believe that a decent family, besides being forbidden so often by their Bible, would drink, cook with, and baptize with water from three to five months or a year, in which, in a cistern, from four or five to ten men and women and children daily immersed themselves? How preposterous! Yet this was all so if immersionists are to be believed here.

It was at the end of such a universal practice of affusion that the Harbinger said, "I baptize with water, he shall baptize with the Holy Spirit." It was in the familiar use of the term, I will pour water on him that is thirsty, all modal allusions being to affusion, sprinkle, pour water, Is. xlv. 3; Ezek. xxxvi. 25, etc., that the baptism of the Spirit was always a pouring of it on the people.

(12). Finally, we come to the ancient versions. We have seen that the Syriac, Ethiopic, Itala, Vulgate, Sahidic, Basmuric, the more modern Lusitania and Lutheran of the sixteenth century, all translate *bapto* sprinkle. We have seen the most learned of all the Greek Fathers, Origen, Irenæus, Hippolytus, do so.

We have seen that the Itala and Jerome translate baptize in Chaldee *tzeva*, by sprinkle, *conspergatur* and *infunderis*. Yet they never render baptize by dip or immerse. If immerse was the word for *baptidzo*, if *baptidzo* were *immergo* or *intingo* in Latin, why there, in those two Latin versions, was the very place to exhibit it. Immerse is pure Latin anglicized. That was the chance to render it immerse or dip. But no, not once do they do so. All the versions for the first fifteen hundred years after Christ made from the original, are with us, every one supports affusion, not one supports dipping. We have not time to review them. We bring up the grand old Syriac, the version so eulogized by Dr. J. R. Graves, quotation from Judd, so praised by Gale, the best version, most literal, accurate and pure ever made. We appeal to this as the version made in the apostolic age, when and where the translators

knew both tongues, and knew the apostolic practice. Between James' version and the apostles a thousand years of dark ages roll between, a thousand years of superstition and darkness throw their black shadow over the West. Fifteen hundred years roll between them and the apostles. But here is a version made in the apostolic age, in the very country where they preached, in the very language Jesus and the apostles preached in, and what is its testimony? *Baptidzo* is rendered *amad*, same in Arabic and Syriac. We saw that *louo*, wash, pour, sprinkle, in Greek is rendered *amad* in Syriac before Christ's day. We saw immerse in Greek never was. No case is found where immerse, none where dip, is ever rendered *amad*. But *amad*, to wash, made wet with rain, sprinkle, bedew, to moisten with dew, to perfuse, this word translates *baptidzo* into the apostolic version. It translates it in the Arabic version in the golden age of Arabic learning, when Plato, Aristotle, etc., were translated into Arabic, when algebra was discovered by the Arabs as a science, and the courts of Al Raschid and Habroun were more academies than courts. In that age also *baptidzo* in the New Testament is translated by *gasala*, the word used for washing the face, washing a babe only a day old, for a lady sprinkling aromatic waters or rose water on her head or hair. And is this immersion?

We showed that *amad* translated *baptidzo* in the apostolic age. That it applied, in Arabic and Syriac, to sprinkling, pouring—such as falling rain, dew, water of any kind. It was to wash, cleanse. It never meant immerse in the New Testament. Its noun applies in John to the washing at Siloam. We saw that *louo*, wash, pour, sprinkle is translated *amad* in Susana before the birth of Christ. Nowhere is immerse—*buthidzo*, *pontidzo*, *kataduno*, *enduo*, *dupto* (dip) translated *amad*, nor is *tabha* immerse in Hebrew ever rendered *amad*. Not only does Catafago, who lived sixteen years in the country where this version was made, in the lexicon I hold in my hand, define the word—"the being wet with rain"—that is the only definition he gives it—but Castell's immortal work in which nineteen men, the most learned, the scholarship of that renowned century of learning, seventeenth

—who had the researches of Kimchi, Maimonides, Schindler the Buxtorffs and Pocock before him—Selden and Golius—this based in Syriac on the two great Manuscript Lexicons of two native Syrians in the ninth and tenth centuries while their language was a living one—being equivalent then, to twenty-one, Catafago making twenty-two, Syriac lexicons and Arabic (Catafago's Arabic,) all giving sprinkle moisten, wet with rain, dew, water as its *prevailing* meaning—immerse no New Testament meaning at all—only once in Old Testament there baptize does not occur in the original—such is the word that translates *baptidzo* in the Syriac and Arabic New Testament.

We saw that this old Syriac translates baptize (*tabhal*) the first time it ever occurs. Gen. xxxvii. 31, by sprinkle.

Then we saw that there were other versions of great value in second, third and fourth centuries, all agreeing substantially with this. Every one of them on till the close of the fifteenth century, so far as they were from the Hebrew and Greek equally sustained affusion—not one favoring immersion.

We turned to that old Peshito, apostolic version, and found that affusion was sustained by its text throughout. The Syriac and Arabic have another word for *baptidzo*. It is *tzeva*, pronounced *tseva* (heavier sound) in Arabic. It is used for *baptidzo* in the second and subsequent centuries, and in Syriac and Chaldee for *bapto* and *baptidzo*, immersionists assure us in days before Christ. Indeed it occurs in the fifth century before Christ in Daniel several times, rendered *bapto* in Greek. Either *tzeva* or *amal* was used in the commission. Hence we read Ps. vi. 6 (7): "My couch have I *baptized with my tears*." In Ezek. xxii. 24: "Thou art the land that is not *baptized*; no, upon thee the rain has not fallen." So reads the old apostolic Syriac. In Luke vii 38, 44, it occurs twice—take the last—"Simon, into thy house I came; water upon my feet you gave me not. But she with her tears my feet hath *baptized*." So verse 38 "She began to baptize his feet with her tears."

O, sir, the best you can do is to infer that they went

from four acres of forty-five feet deep water at Jerusalem to Jordan and Enon to get water enough in which to dip a man, but it is all absurd. A. Campbell says, after pressing the case of the Eunuch—the “inference is” he immersed him. Elder Wilkes urges that all he could adduce supported “the hypothesis” that Philip immersed him. They have only an inference—a process so doubtful in their estimation, that they utterly discredit all arguments of inference when they come to infant baptism. But here we ask for facts—we want no inference. We present no hypothesis. We know the mode where David’s falling tears baptized the couch—the pouring rain baptized the land. The woman kneeled over the unsanctified feet of Jesus—the tears dropped down one by one, and fell upon his feet—a clear affusion—not one-tenth nor hundredth the amount I always pour on babes I baptize. And he says: “My feet hath she baptized with her tears.” No dark ages roll between this old Syriac and the apostles—no superstitious and multiplied accumulations of them.

We showed that not till the beginning of the third century could immersion be found; it was not named as baptism; and when it was by three dips, oil administered, honey and milk given, and they admitted they had no gospel authority for it. The first man who names mersion as baptism, also uses *tingo* constantly, *adspergo* and *perfun-do*—sprinkle for it, *tingo* being used as our baptize, not restricted to any mode. The moment we find *mergo*, *mergito* applied, we find it three dips, and superstition reigning. They believed there was “medical virtue” in the water and “sanctifying grace.” Hence they mersed themselves into it to absorb and “imbibe” the regenerating efficacy. It was not for mode. No merit or importance attached to that. It was purely a superstition as to the cleansing power of water,” under invocation of the priest.” With Tertullian, mersion was the simplest way of absorbing the grace out of the water.

Again, I challenge Dr. Graves, as over and again I have done, to find in all the world, where baptism was administered as Baptists do—by one “immersion”—dip—into the water earlier than the fourth century after Christ. He cannot do it. The

first time baptism in the world's history was administered by one "immersion," by a single dip—performed as you perform it, was in the fourth century. It was then denounced by the whole church as a "heresy," "an innovation," and causing a "heresy!" (See Eunomius, Hist. Eccles., ch. xxvi. 282–284.)

And now, dear friends, look at the facts. All Greek lexicons sustain us; seven-tenths of them utterly crush our opponent. All Hebrew lexicons support us—all refute his even as a possible mode, as to the Bible. All Syriac lexicons support us, and crush his hopes of ever supporting his mode. All ancient versions support us, not one tolerates his mode, let alone his wild theory. The only point is, are his people baptized at all, or not? All the classics support ours as the only mode. All the English arguments—the great Laver baptism—one trillion, six hundred and forty-five billions, five hundred millions, at lowest count, all by affusion—not one immersion—these are the explanations of the expression: "I baptize with water!" Such are the facts. Brethren we are baptized! The only question in doubt is, have these "Baptists" been baptized? If Dr. Graves' rules are to be adhered to; if they are rightly applied by him, not a Baptist here is baptized, save the few who may have gone out from us. Sirs, we have the facts. We intend to conquer *a peace*. Yes, sir, we mean it; "mean business!" You have to give it up. We have the facts, the authorities, the documents. We began not this war, you began it. We begged for peace; you clamored for war. Now you have it, and the result is upon you, before you. We repeat it, all the doubt is on your side; not a shadow on ours. You may be, you may not be baptized. We are baptized. If you wish, then, to be sure, certain, have no doubt, let it be as it was in apostolic days; as the Spirit defines it, by pouring. The Lord pour upon you all his baptizing Spirit.

THE
GREAT CARROLLTON DEBATE.

SECOND PROPOSITION.

INFANT BAPTISM, AS PRACTICED BY THE METHODIST CHURCH
SOUTH, IS AUTHORIZED BY THE WORD OF GOD.

DR. DITZLER Affirms.

DR. GRAVES Denies.

[DR. DITZLER'S OPENING SPEECH.]

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—With Dr. Graves we agree that this subject has been treated superficially. Yes, by both parties to it. That both parties have largely, some exclusively, relied on superficial, outside issues and accidents of the general issue, both for defense and attack, instead of discovering some great and solid principle of truth around which all else revolves as connected with the matter. We are glad to see from his previous article in *The Baptist* of last August that we can have a fair and, I hope, full discussion on the real principles involved.

It is agreed by all parties to this question that infant membership, the greater matter, the genus, necessarily carries with it the less, the species, baptism, and therefore we are under no particular necessity to discuss the species, baptism, unless we prefer to do so. We, however, will do so, and elaborately at that, in due time and order.

Nor do we propose to be drawn aside from the main issue involved by minor, outside ones. In discussions of this kind,

we often see, by arts of attack or defense, both parties drifting far off from the main question, and side issues, not involved in it, consume all the time. To quote what the learned say, when they, on all sides, can be quoted for a dozen antagonistic points here, is not to the matter. Hence, this book, the Bible, and generally in plain English dress, will be our standard throughout. It is a Bible question, and by that book it must stand or fall.

My first great object will be to prove that God's people, the "saved by grace," in all ages, all time, constitute *the church of God*, the foundation and source of whose salvation was and is the redemption of Jesus Christ, "the beginner and the finisher of *the faith*" or plan of salvation, by which all are saved. And as morally responsible parties are to exercise faith, in order to obtain this salvation, yet infants are born within its gracious embrace and influence or provisions, so while adults are required to have faith and exercise the virtues of religious life to enjoy membership in God's family—flock, yea, household, church—infants are members thereof without need of these, and until by actual transgression and rejection of God, adults are entitled to their place in the church, and do have it; so infants until they grow to rebel and transgress and take on a positive character of active sinfulness, are entitled to recognition in God's church. This entire hour shall be devoted, therefore, to the one great point, that carries all else with it—the oneness of God's church in all ages, through all dispensations, especially the two great dispensations known as Mosaic and Christian.

Let it be understood, we do not confound church and state—the fleshy, national and spiritual Israel. We recognize the difference fully. But who can point out God's spiritual Israel to-day? Where is there a complete organization that corresponds to it? Who can show it? Let this be remembered, for in just this phase of God's ancient church will our opponent have to make his issue.

It is a little remarkable that John the Harbinger should come and preach steadily for six months "to prepare the people for the Lord" at his coming, and with an eye to that should bap-

tize, that Christ might have a proper occasion of being made known or manifested to Israel—shown openly, known. See Robinson on (ophaneroo) and John xxi, 1, 14; 1 John i, 2; John i, 31. Yet never once uses the word church, though he announces the Messiah as about to “thoroughly purge his floor,” elevate, purify and separate the chaff from the wheat, and repair thus “the breach.”

Jesus Messiah comes, is announced by “the baptizer,” and for over two years never names the church, so far as our documents go, and in all his discourses only twice, and then as a familiar term: Matt. xvi, 18; xviii, 17. This leads us to a strict, though brief inquiry as to the use of this word church. The New Testament gets it from the Old, all must admit. The Greek New Testament word is *ekkklesia*, meaning called, called out, assembled, congregated, and by way of eminence, applied to God’s people as the called. It is the immediate translation of the Hebrew *khehal*, meaning called, assembled. In the Greek Scriptures and Apocrypha familiar to the Jews, the word constantly occurs and is appropriated by the Savior and Apostles from the same which they used constantly.

Like baptize, sanctify, etc., it is used both in a secular and strictly religious sense. Often in both the Old and New Testaments the word is applied to secular, worldly assemblies as well as to God’s people. These are facts all admit. Hence the connection must show in what sense the word is used, as in all other words. Our James’ translators never render the term by church in the Old Testament, and some often render it congregation in the New, where we have church.

Not only does the word constantly occur in the Old Testament, but a few quotations will show that it was familiar to the literature of Jews before Christ, as it is now to us. For example, in the uninspired books B. C., 1 Maccabees xi, 56, we read, “Joshua fulfilled his word, etc. Caleb for bearing witness in the church (*en ekklesia*) received the heritage, etc.”

Ecclesiasticus xxiv, 2, (1 in Greek) “in the church (*ekkklesia*) of the Most High shall she open her mouth”—speaking of the coming Messiah under the name of Wisdom. Again, xlv, 15, speaking of the holy and good of all ages, naming

Enoch, Noah, Abraham, etc., etc., he says, "the church shall show forth their praise," etc.

With this we must remember they used the word in a double sense just as we do now, the one as we do congregation, or individual parts of the great family of God. To such a conception of God's people they, as we, applied various terms, of which the leading two were *ekklesia* and *synagogue* (sunagogue.) This term is used throughout the Old Testament and in the New for an assembly of the church. So James uses it ii, 2; Ps. xl, 10, 12, *ekklesia* is interchanged with synagogue (*sunagogue*). The term Christ used is in this sense, Matt. xviii, 17, 20. It means an assembly, congregation, quite the same as church. Then they, as we, used it (church) to represent all God's people on earth, as, e. g., Eph. ii, 22, 23; Col. i, 18, 24; I Cor. xii, 13; Tim. iii, 15, etc.

The two occasions Christ had to use it, in the first it occurs in the broad sense of his whole church as an institution on earth, with all its agencies and functions. Matt. xvi, 18. In the other, it is in the other sense of a local congregation—tell it to the congregation—the membership in affiliation with that offending brother who is to be cut off, excommunicated.

Now it is perfectly plain that as now, we can only know and come into visible, tangible contact with God's great spiritual family, "the church of the living God," outwardly, we repeat through means of its congregational, which is its visible representation; yet these, aggregated, constitute at least the greatest part of his spiritual church (invisible on earth) so called, i. e., in this sense of representing all his, but in these assemblies, associations, congregations, its working and official acts are manifest, and in these we have our recognition to membership, and ordinances are administered, church duties recognized: so it was in the former time. It only wants a glance of the eye at what confronts us to-day, to see all that confronts us as to the past.

We have thus elaborately explained these matters, and the differences between the spiritual church as a whole, and its doings as a people separated into visible, tangible assemblies, that you might have a clear conception of the way member-

ship in all ages has been recognized officially, and a knowledge of this question.

Hence, as now, so anciently, sinners might assemble, and did assemble, with God's people in the temple, (in the synagogues later) corresponding to our churches built now, mingled with them; and, as now, so then, in the fellowship of the church visible, represented by its congregations, there were "sinners in Zion." So now, and in apostolic days as recognized by Christ, Matt. xviii, 17; by the parable also, "Let both grow together."

Now, then, *in every sense that God now has a church on earth, with its offices and ordinances visibly displayed, its functions acknowledged, he had in the past ages, and essentially for the same ends.*

Let us carefully now take up each point involved, and then weave them all into one solid texture. Then God had a people in the ages before the incarnation, called throughout the Old Scriptures, the uninspired Apocrypha, and in the New Testament, called the church, in which infants were recognized as members or having membership.

1. The Old Testament term, we have seen, occurs constantly. The one borrowed in the New, Christ and Paul as Jews to Jews use a term for long centuries familiar, and used by them exactly as by us, in a three-fold sense (1) for any assembly, secular, etc.; (2) for individual congregations of God's people; (3) for the whole family of God.

2. In the Apocryphal writings before Christ, we see, it is used exactly as in the New Testament, for all God's people.

3. In Acts vii, 38, "This is he that was in the church in the wilderness."

In Hebrews ii, 12, Paul quotes it from David as found in the Psalm xxii, 22, eleven centuries B. C., "In the midst of the church, will I sing praise unto thee." Here now we have Paul applying the word church to the people of God in their spiritual capacity, praising God. The only question here is, did he use it in the carnal sense, or as we, in the religious sense. The words and the connections both make it plain that he uses it

as David meant it, in the religious sense. Read the entire connection :

Hebrews ii, 9. But we see that Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man.

10. For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.

11. For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one, for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren,

12. Saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren; in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee.

13. And again, I will put my trust in him. And again, Behold I and the children which God hath given me.

Here notice—Jesus Christ, we all agree, is the party here referred to by David and Paul. That he is here represented as the captain of their salvation, who in bringing many sons unto glory, should be made perfect through sufferings. He sanctifies them, is one with them, all one, and calls them brethren; nay, they are the children which God hath given him. In no place in the New Testament is the word church used in a clearer light for a spiritual, religious body.

Indeed, but for the blinding influences of party prejudices, it might and would naturally be asked, did not the great Jehovah desire the people he led, planted as a vine, legislated for, was a husband unto them, engraved them on his hand, did he not desire, and legislate for them, that they might be a spiritual people? And if they, or any part of them failed, whose fault was it? Was it not theirs? Does he not ask, "What more he could do that he had not done? Do not many, yea, thousands fail and millions now, and hundreds of millions, to comply with God's laws and terms; but does it prove that he has no spiritual church, or that the failure is because of any essential defect in his economy?

We have shown now, that in the centuries before the incarnation, God had a church, in the New Testament sense of the word, when properly and religiously, not secularly, applied.

Second, though not necessary to our point, yet because men have been so wild on this subject, that we wish to place it in

the clearest scriptural light, that all may see and understand, we proceed in the second place to show that they worshipped God and kept his ordinances, read and heard read the scriptures in family capacity and as visible congregations as now. They had their family services, as the case of Abraham, Gen. xviii, 19; Job, Zachariah, Joshua, xxiv, 15, etc., show; in the temple, in the great congregation, Psalms xxii, 25; the assemblies of the upright, xxvi, 12; cxlix, 1, 2; xv, 1, 2; lxxxv, 1, 2, 7, 10, 11, etc.. etc., and after the captivity they worshipped in synagogues as well as in the temple. The whole Bible is full of proofs that they had church order, rules, regulations, elders, deacons or officers of the special congregations as we have now; indeed, after which ours in Apostolic days were clearly chosen, as Lightfoot, Webster, Selden and others show. That members were liable to expulsion then as now, for immorality, etc., Ezra x, 8; v. 12, 13; 1 Kings ii, 26, 27, as well as Gen. xvii, 14; John ix, 22, 34, 35; xvi, 2, show. The Jews had twenty-four great and prominent reasons enumerated from the books of Moses, for which they excommunicated people.

Both Lightfoot and Selden copy them at length, the one in his *Horæ Hebraicæ et Tal*; the other, in his *Sunedriis*. In it occurs this language: "Whosoever is excommunicated by the president of the Sanhedrim, is cut off from the whole church of Israel." In some cases they were suspended till reparation, confession, etc., could be made; if not, and found guilty, they were shammatized, (corresponding to our anathematized; 1 Cor., xvi. 22. See Buxtorff and Castell on this word; latter, page 3795-6), "excommunicated totally and finally." Yet these expulsions did not forfeit an ordinary citizen's political rights. Nay, often all their highest political franchises were taken away, yet their religious and ecclesiastical rites, laws, and privileges were allowed and exercised by them, though church and state were so united there. Yet you see in all this they were distinct also. At times, the state from without, conquering state, as Rome, or the overpowering the authorities of faction, or other influences, changed the ministry, interrupted the order of things, but that was no

more a peculiarity or accident to the church, than that such things have been since the days of Paul. During the late war many, many just such things occurred.

3. This church was spiritual in the same sense that the church is spiritual *to-day*. It had bad ministers and members in it then, laws to regulate their conduct; it had bad members and ministers in it in Paul's and John's day, Acts xx. 29, 30; Gal. xi. 4; 3 John, iii. 8, 10; 2 Peter, ii. 1; and as we have now.

1. Jesus Christ was their spiritual life and the object of their faith. You are all aware that dividing our Bible into chapters and verses is a modern invention, accomplished in the sixteenth century. Often the divisions are very unfortunate and break the connection, as all scholars agree. In Hebrews, from the last of chapter x. to xii., this is done. Paul tells us, Hebrews x. 38, 39: "Now the just shall live by faith." Here he lays down a great truth, copied from the Old Testament (Hab. xi. 9.) Yea, "believe to the saving of the soul," 39. He proves this from the record of the worthies in the Old Testament whence he drew his text. The catalogue runs clear through the eleventh chapter—they died in faith. "Moses esteemed the reproach of Christ." Abraham, as Christ tells us, saw Christ's day, and was glad. These, then, all proved, fully tested the fact that it is by faith the just live. They are, therefore, (ch. xiii. 1, 2), "a cloud of Witnesses" to the saving efficacy of faith in Christ, as those who saw the promises afar off * * and embraced them," (xi. 13); and, therefore, (xii. 2) Jesus is declared to be "the founder (*beginner*) and the finisher of the faith" (*taes pisteos*) presented ch. x. 38, 39, illustrated throughout ch. xi., making the cloud of "witnesses" to it, with the Jesus whom he introduces in chapters i. and ii., as the one whom angels adore, the captain of the salvation of his people, and hence "the founder and consummator of *the* faith." In James' version, the definite article (*taes*) is thrown out, and, in italics "our" is substituted, destroying the beauty of Paul's sense, as far as possible.

Jesus Christ then was the object of their faith. This is

further taught in 1. Peter i. 9, 11; John i. 12, 18; Gal. iii. 6, 9; 1. Cor. x. 3, 4; Hebrews iv. 2; Is. liii. 4, 6, 11.

1 Peter i. 9: "Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls.

"10. Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you :

"11. Searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow."

John i. 12: "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name :

"13. Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God ;

"14. And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.

"17. For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.

"18. No man hath seen God at any time ; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him."

Here we learn in John that before the incarnation, declared in verse 14, he, Christ, "was in the world; the world was made by him;" as verses 1 and 3 declared "all things were made by him," and "without him was nothing made that was made." But not only is he the source of all favor and creative energy, 3, of "life," 4, and "light," 5, but all *regenerating grace* is through him ; ch. v. 12 and 13; all who believed "were born of God." Then he recurs to it in verses 17 and 18. No man ever saw God. He is only revealed through Christ. Hence the only begotten Son, this Word, this source of all light and life, revealed or declared him. Moses gave the written law, but (not as in our version again where the translators never knew what John was talking about, leave out his definite article "THE") *the law* was given by Moses, but *THE GRACE* (*he charis*) and the truth came through (*he alætheia*) Jesus Christ. See, too, how he contrasts the "they and them" with the "we" and "us" of verse 14, where he was incarnated and *tabernacled* (*eskenosen*) among us ; dwelt in a veil of flesh as his glory anciently shone in the tabernacle, from which name comes the verb in the Greek here. How beautiful!

Now let us see another example of how the light and the truth were revealed to them in Moses' day.

1 Cor. x. 2. "And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea."

3. "And did all eat the same spiritual meat."

4. "And did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual Rock, that followed them; and that Rock was Christ."

Need we comment on this language to show that Christ comes unto his own, and that they were born of God? They ate spiritual meat, drank spiritual drink; hence they drank of Christ, the Rock of their salvation. Was that spiritual?

Do you desire more? Does not Paul show at length, Rom. iv., 11, Gal. iii. 6, 9, that Abraham, the representative man, before the ceremonial or ritualistic day of the church, and David, the representative of the ritualistic age or dispensation, were both pardoned exactly alike, by faith, and both as we are? Does he not tell us, Heb. iv. 2; Gal. iii. 8, that the Gospel was preached to them under both dispensations? Do you want a sample of how it was preached?

Isa. liii. 3, "He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief; and we hid as it were our faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not.

4. "Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows, yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.

5. "But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed.

6. "All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.

7. "He was oppressed and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth; he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth.

8. "He was taken from prison and from judgment; and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgressions of my people was he stricken.

* * * * *

11. "He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied; by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities."

Ah! what preaching was this? Would that we had more of it now, instead of so much mere twaddle, butterfly rhetoric

and emasculated preaching we too often hear! Here Isaiah, standing at the temple door, or by the altar pointing to the bleeding lamb as the type of the great sufferer, represents him as already having come in the flesh, as already having bled, died in our stead. For he was as a Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, to the faith of those who saw afar off and embraced the promises. Thus Isaiah uses the present tense and speaks of Christ's work of redemption as though already accomplished eight hundred years before he actually hung upon the cross.

4th. So these people of God, stretching through the ages, all gathered to the cross, as the trophies of redemption through Jesus Christ, to whom all in heaven will owe redemption; to whose blood all redeemed ones will ascribe their salvation. Paul, in his burst of holy enthusiasm, applies the term church in the strongest and most emphatic sense.

Heb. xii. 23. "To the general assembly and church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect."

What a strong expression. The general assembly and church of the first-born which are written in heaven; in the Lamb's book of life. Wonder if there are any infants there? If so, as on earth, so in heaven, they constitute a part of the church of the first-born—of those in heaven.

Ephesians iii. 14. For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

15. "Of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named."

Here the Apostle's eye sweeps the whole human horizon; over all time, past and future; God's church is composed of God's whole family in heaven and on earth, and they are all named in honor of Jesus Christ. Hence in coming to Christ we now are represented as joining them thus:

Heb. xii. 22. "But ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels."

It is this august body that we of the Christian Dispensation are represented as uniting ourselves with, in accepting Christ, which Paul denominates as quoted above, "the general assembly and church of the first-born."

5. To the Church, developed out of God's covenant and assurance of redemption, in all the prophets, God gave promises of perpetuity, permanent success and constant development into broader and more extensive proportions until the consummation of all things.

Of these, such as Isaiah xxx: 5; xliii: 32; xliv: 4; lviii: 11-14; xlii: 19; lix and lvi entire, applied in part by Paul, Gal. iv: 26-28; Rom. xi: 1, 5, 7, 11, 16, 26 are sufficient samples.

Let us examine and apply some of these constant promises of God to Israel. If they are not true and God's promises false, where can we stand?

Isaiah xlix: 5. Though Israel be not gathered, yet shall I be glorious in the eyes of the Lord, and my God shall be my strength.

6. And he said, It is a light thing that thou shouldst be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the ends of the earth.

8. Thus saith the Lord, In an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in a day of salvation have I helped thee: and I will preserve thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, to establish the earth, to cause to inherit the desolate heritages.

9. That thou mayest say to the prisoners, Go forth; to them that are in darkness, Shew yourselves.

13. Sing, O heavens; and be joyful, O earth; and break forth into singing, O mountains: for the Lord hath comforted his people and will have mercy upon his afflicted.

"14. But Zion said, The Lord hath forsaken me, and my Lord hath forgotten me.

"15. Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? Yea, they may forget, yet will I not forget thee.

"16. Behold, I have graven thee upon the palms of my hands; thy walls are continually before me.

"17. Thy children shall make haste; thy destroyers and they that made thee waste shall go forth of thee.

"18. Lift up thine eyes round about, and behold; all these gather themselves together, and come to thee. As I live, saith the Lord, thou shalt surely clothe thee with them all, as with an ornament, and bind them on thee, as a bride doeth.

"19. For thy waste and thy desolate places, and the land of destruction shall even now be too narrow by reason of the inhabitants, and they that swallowed thee up shall be far away.

"20. The children which thou shalt have, after thou hast lost the other, shall say again in thine ears, The place is too strait for me; give place to me that I may dwell.

"21. Then shalt thou say in thine heart, Who hath begotten me these, seeing I have lost my children, and am desolate, a captive, and removing to and fro? and who hath brought up these? Behold, I was left alone; these, where had they been?

"22. This saith the Lord God, Behold, I will lift up mine hand to the Gentiles, and set up my standard to the people: and they shall bring thy sons in their arms, and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders."

How strong, how complete these promises. Were they true, or were they not?

They, in large part, yet remain to be fulfilled. But who believes that all Gentile nations, the fulness of the Gentiles, were to be converted and brought as such, to the national Israel; the political, or politico-religious Israel? Nobody. The New Testament writers apply these prophecies to the conversion of Gentile nations, and we, and all Christian expositors, so apply them. Do we believe them? But God's remnant, the preserved of Israel, were to be given for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth, 5 6. Yea, 6, 8, I will preserve thee; the Jewish Israel; the remnant, and give thee for a covenant of the people, to establish the earth, to cause to inherit the desolate places. All the converted Gentiles were to come to thee; thou shalt clothe thee with them all; v 18. Here Isaiah declares or God through him, these great truths, and all admit the meaning.

It was Zion, the remnant, the church that had these promises. But Zion said, the Lord (to whom Jehovah declared himself a husband, yea, married to her, Zion said, the Lord, [my husband]) hath forsaken me; forgotten me; v 14. Then read what tender expressions follow to encourage. When Zion mourns the loss of so many to be broken off, "lost," v 20, and the place made vacant by the loss of so many broken off by unbelief, God promises that such shall be the inflow and compensation from Gentile converts to fill up the place made vacant by the loss of the Jews, that the place will be too strait for me; v 20, 22.

Hence it is said the cords shall be lengthened, the stakes strengthened: that is, the fallen tabernacle should be "*rebuilt*;"

"*raised up*," "*strengthened*." Christ would repair the breach, restore the paths.

Hence he was to be called the Restorer; yea, Isaiah; lviii, 12, saith, And they that shall be of these shall build the old waste places; thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations; and thou shalt be called *the Repairer of the breach, the Restorer of paths to walk in.*" Hence.

Isaiah ix; 1. "Arise, shine: for thy light is come, and the Glory of the Lord is risen upon thee.

"3. And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising.

"4. Lift up thine eyes round about, and see: all they gather themselves together, they come to thee: thy sons shall come from far and thy daughters shall be nursed at thy side.

"5. Then thou shalt see, and flow together, and thine heart shall fear, and be enlarged; because the abundance of the sea shall be converted unto thee; the forces of the Gentiles shall come unto thee.

11. Therefore thy gates shall be open continually; they shall not be shut day nor night; that men may bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles, and that their kings may be brought.

15. Whereas thou hast been forsaken and hated, so that no man went through thee I will make thee an eternal excellency, a joy of many generations.

Such are the encouragements held out to Zion in Isaiah's day. If our position be wrong, all these prophecies have failed and do fail forever.

It is in view of such facts, that Christ declared, Matt. xvi, 18, On this rock will I build; *oikodomæso*, rebuild, to rebuild, renew, to build up, establish, confirm. See Robinson's Greek lexicon on *oikodomeo*. Wahl, 2d large edition, 1829, renders it also *rebuild, renew*, (*reædifico, instauro*), also to augment, *give increase to, cause that the structure shall be continued, etc.*, (*augeo, incrementum facio, est scruttura continuatur, etc.*) Stokius also gives "to confirm, establish." So Peter viewed it, when he said, Acts xv, 16, "After this I will return, and will *build again* the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down, and I will *build again the ruins thereof*, and I will *set it up.*"

And, like Isaiah and the prophets, he tells why:

"That the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things."

Hence Christ's assuming the entire government, taking all on his own shoulders (Is. ix. 6, 7) and instead of representing him as establishing a *new* government from thence, he only speaks of its "*increase*," to which there shall be no end. He was to establish the Kingdom of David; the fallen tabernacle. Hence,

Isaiah x, 20. "And it shall come to pass in that day, that the *remnant* of Israel, and such as are escaped of the house of Jacob, shall no more again stay upon him that smote them; but shall stay upon the Lord, the Holy One of Israel, in truth.

21. The *remnant* shall return, even the remnant of Jacob, unto the mighty God.

22. For though thy people Israel be as the sand of the sea, yet a remnant of them shall return: the consumption decreed shall overflow with righteousness.

24. And it shall come to pass in that day, that his burden shall be taken away from off thy shoulder, and his yoke from off thy neck, and the yoke shall be destroyed because of the *anointing*.

Notice now, that God here promised that when Messiah should be anointed, a *remnant*, as Joel declares also, should be spared, as he ever does afterwards, as seen chap. xlix, already quoted. Paul takes up these facts and makes his great argument out of them.

Rom. x, 20. But Esaias is very bold, and saith, I was found of them that sought me not; I was made manifest unto them that asked not after me.

21. But to Israel he saith, All day long I have stretched forth my hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people.

Rom. xi, 1, I say then, Hath God cast away his people? God forbid. For I also am an Israelite of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin.

2. God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew. Wot ye not that the Scripture saith of Elias? how he maketh intercession to God against Israel, saying,

3. Lord, they have killed thy prophets, and digged down thine altars; and I am left alone, and they seek my life.

4. But what saith the answer of God unto him? I have reserved unto myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal.

5. Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace.

11. I say then, Have they stumbled that they should fall? God forbid; but rather through their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles, for to provoke them to jealousy.

12. Now if the fall of them be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles; how much more their fullness.

13. For I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office:

14. If by any means I may provoke to emulation them which are my flesh, and might save some of them.

15. For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?

16. For if the first-fruit be holy the lump is also holy; and if the root be holy so are the branches.

17. And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree;

18. Boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee.

19. Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in.

20. Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded, but fear.

21. For if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee.

22. Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in his goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut off.

23. And they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in: for God is able to graft them in again.

24. For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree which is wild by nature, and wert grafted contrary to nature into a good olive tree; how much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree.

25. For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits, that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in.

26. And so all Israel shall be saved; as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob:

27. For this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins.

Here we see a mass of truth. This remnant, Paul reminds the Gentiles, was God's covenant unto them, as we quoted it from Isaiah—this remnant should be God's covenant for salvation unto the end of the earth.

Notice clearly that the unbelieving Jews who reject the Messiah, stumbled, were blinded, blindness in part—not to all.

only in part—happened to Israel. Hence they fell, were cast away, were broken off. From what were they broken off? From what cut off? They had been the natural branches, into whose vacated place believing Gentiles were brought in—grafted in. If at any future time the unbelieving Jews receive Christ, be converted, they will be grafted in again, into the relation and place they lost, from which they fell in rejecting Messiah. But into what were Gentiles brought? Into the Church, you say. Yes, and out of it unbelief put the rejecting Jews. If they shall hereafter believe, and thus come into Christ's church, that is receiving them, as God is able to graft them in again. And when that is done, Paul declares that in that act, they are grafted into their own good olive tree, from which unbelief had separated, cut them off.

In accordance with these facts, Paul, Heb. viii, 8, says: I will complete (*sunteleso*). So A. Campbell has it in his essay; it is to complete, consummate, perfect. Schleusner, Robinson, Wahl, &c., a new covenant with the house (church) of Israel.

Sixth—Two leading kinds of ordinances distinguished the Levitical or ritualistic period of the church, the one class memorial, another class symbolic of the necessity of purity and innocence. The latter in two most prominent parts alone demand attention. One was circumcision, instituted in Abraham's day, (Gen. xvii, 11, 14, 24, 25), but afterwards to be administered to children at 8 days old (Gen. xxi, 4.)

Now this ordinance was ever after that symbolic of the purity of the heart, and was so deemed by the prophets and Paul. A few of many passages will sufficiently show this. Gen. xvii, 11, it was to be a token. Paul quotes it Rom. iv, 11. "And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also."

It was administered at 8 days old, yet was to be in all after life, a sign and seal of the righteousness of faith. But one says, that was only so to Abraham. Then why does Paul

make it so to all who proved true to their God? Hear him in Romans again, ii, 28, 29 :

28. For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly ; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh :

29. But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly ; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter ; whose praise is not of men, but of God.

And why does he show it so pointedly, Col. ii, 11, 12 : "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ."

Hence constantly the prophets said "circumcise your hearts to love the Lord your God," from Moses in Deuteronomy until Jeremiah and Ezekiel's day. Thus an ordinance that was purely symbolic, was yet administered to infants, and in all after life it was to be of symbolic import. But my argument has no necessary dependence on that fact at all. I narrate these things to make all complete.

Regarding this as parenthetical, we resume our identity argument. In Matt. xxi.

"33. Hear another parable : There was a certain householder, which planted a vineyard, and hedged it round about, and digged a wine press in it, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country.

34. And when the time of the fruit drew near, he sent his servants to the husbandmen, that they might receive the fruits of it.

35. And the husbandman took his servants, and beat one, and killed another, and stoned another.

36. Again, he sent other servants more than the first ; and they did unto them likewise.

37. But last of all he sent unto them his son, saying, They will reverence my son.

38. But when the husbandmen saw the son, they said among themselves This is the heir ; come, let us kill him, and let us seize on his inheritance

39. And they caught him, and cast him out of the vineyard, and slew him.

"40. When the Lord therefore of the vineyard cometh, what will he do unto those husbandmen ?

"41. They say unto him, He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen, which shall render him the fruits in their seasons.

"42. Jesus saith unto them, Did ye never read in the Scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes?"

"43. Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof."

Here you see the force of this beautiful parable. It represents the kingdom of God as entrusted to the Jews, as a vineyard is leased out. He sent prophets, later he sent other prophets, as the husbandmen sent servants, but last of all as the one sent his own son, so God sent his only son, and they slew him. What will he do? We saw Paul's letter to the Romans ch. xi., what he could do to the unbelieving; they were cut off, cast away, the kingdom is taken from them and given into the hands of the Gentiles, the Jewish remnant, the preserved were God's covenant to the Gentiles, they brought in.

And now let us follow it out in the actual record:

When Christ came, he was born, reared, lived in the Jewish Church. He complained not of its principles, but of the vast numbers of those who violated them. He gathered together all the most pious he could for three years and six months. Great numbers received him, believed, were saved. Great numbers, the vast majority, ultimately rejected him, as the prophets plainly indicated. He sent out his ministers, limited to Israel. To whom does he send them? To the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Matt. x. 6.

Thus for three years and a half, he seeks to restore the paths, repair the breach, and gather together the outcasts, for they were as sheep without a shepherd. He is a Jew—they are all Jews. They are "*Jews inwardly*." Israelites indeed without guile. Simeon, the Marys, Elizabeth, Zachariah, were of the same class—the apostles, disciples (70) and others of the remnants waiting for the promise to redeem Israel. Thus works he till his crucifixion. What do we find on Pentecost? For days they had waited the promised descent of the Spirit. They elect one in the place of Judas, to do the work of a church. When the Spirit descended, whom does it find waiting and blest? There has been a great want of attention just here, as in so many other matters.

Acts ii. 1, "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place.

"2. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting.

"3. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them.

"4. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.

"5. And there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven.

"6. Now when this was noised abroad, the multitude came together, and were confounded, because that every man heard them speak in his own language.

"7. And they were all amazed and marvelled, saying one to another, Behold, are not all these which speak Galileans?

"8. And how hear we every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born?

"9. Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, and in Judea, and Capadocia. in Pontus, and Asia.

"10. Phrygia, and Pamphylia, in Egypt, and in the parts of Libya about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes.

"11. Cretes and Arabians, we do hear *them* speak in *our* tongues *the wonderful works of God*.

"12. And they were all amazed, and were in doubt, saying one to another, What meaneth this?

"13. Others mocking said, These men are full of new wine.

"14. But Peter, standing up with the eleven, lifted up his voice, and said unto them, Ye men of Judea, and all ye that dwell at Jerusalem, be this known unto you, and hearken to my words:

"15. For these are not drunken, as ye suppose. seeing it is but the third hour of the day.

"16. But this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel:

"17. And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams."

The points we wish to call your attention to here are, (1) the apostles do the preaching, verse 11, some days before they were assembled with one hundred and twenty disciples of Jesus. Acts i, 15.

(2). The Spirit falls upon a vast multitude of Christian believers, ii, 5. And there were dwelling (at this time) at Jerusalem, Jews, devout young men, God-fearing, pious men, out of [from] every nation under heaven. On all these the Spirit falls. The uproar of joy brings the motely crowd of scoffing Jews, who had crucified the Messiah. See verse 6 and 7, above. They say, are not all these which speak Galileans? And how hear we every man in our own tongue (our dialect) wherein we were born, Parthians and Medes, etc? See verse 9 and 11, above. We do hear them (all these people from every nation under heaven, Jews, pious men, sojourning in Jerusalem during the great annual convocation, Pentecost) speak in our own tongues, the wonderful works of God; verse 11. Hence this scoffing crowd were all amazed—verse 12; and some of them, mocking, said these men are full of new wine. Peter shows the facts, and quotes Joel in proof that such vast crowds should receive the Spirit; verse 17. Here, then, are the fruits, so far, of Christ's labors. These are the assembled outcasts, gathered together, to whom the Gentiles should be converted. The identity of the church is thus complete and put beyond all possible cavil. On that day three thousand of those scoffers were converted, and added to them (the pious remnants) and daily the Lord added the saved to the church. The church is continued. The unbelieving were rejected by the Almighty, and all such, whether the persecuting Saul or the wicked Caiaphas, had to now receive Messiah as a condition of uniting with the preserved of Israel and such as were escaped of the house of Jacob.

To add to these facts would be to add another hue to the rainbow, or seek to color the violet, or tint the rose afresh. It is complete enough. This is becoming the Almighty. It gives us a standpoint against infidelity that our opponents can never have. The law of commandments contained in ordinances he took out of the way, nailing it to the cross; Eph. ii, 14, 16; as they were added because of transgression, Gal. iii, 16, 19; till the time of reformation, Heb. ix, 10.

As all parties agree, infants were in this church; they received its outward symbolic ordinances. That church exists to-day.

He can never show when, how, for **what** reasons, they were expelled or excluded. We, however, will **next**,

1. Show that infants were in it.
2. That they were baptized in infancy.
3. That their membership was positively recognized by the Apostolic Church, though all this is a work of supererogation not demanded.—[*Time out.*

DR. GRAVES' FIRST REPLY

MR. PRESIDENT:—I stand here to deny the affirmation *that infant baptism is authorized by the Word of God.*

It was the desire of the Baptists of this place to confine the discussion to its proper limits. The command of Christ, since the commission, as Elder Ditzler himself admits, “is the only authority we have to baptize anybody.” But Elder Ditzler’s committee refused, and thus impliedly admitted that they do not believe that the commission is the only law of Christian baptism. Then the committee endeavored to confine it to the New Testament, at least to its precepts and examples, to the teachings and practice of the apostles, but Elder Ditzler’s committee, at his instance, I suppose, declined, and said they wanted the benefit of the whole Bible, thus refusing to admit that the New Testament is the sole rule of faith and practice to the Christian. The question before us in its present verbiage, was then agreed upon, involving the practice of the M. E. Society North and South.

Infant Baptism, as practiced by the M. E. Church, is authorized by the Word of God.

Now, what do we understand by the proposition?

I understand it to imply. 1. The character of the infant, *i. e.*, whether the child of professing parents or not. 2. The purposes for which the rite is administered.

1. The Methodist Society administers the rite indiscriminately. This is characteristic of the Methodists, and in this Presbyterians oppose their practice as unscriptural.

2. The rite is not confined to children of eight days, but of any age, so long as they are considered not accountable. The Discipline does not limit the age—only little children—not infants merely; and I think this is their general practice in the South.

3. That the rite is administered to the children of all, for

the purpose of washing away the guilt of original sin, which, if not thus washed away by baptism, the child cannot be saved.

4. The rite is administered to infants as a means of grace, by the assistance of which God works invisibly in the child, creating within it spiritual life, and “strengthening and confirming its faith in God.”

5. Baptism is the rite by which, in every case, infants, as well as adults, are received into the church, and made members of the same, and not as Presbyterians teach, because they are born into the church, and have, therefore, a right to its ordinances.

I feel warranted in saying that Elder Ditzler, and his friends here, do not believe that infant baptism, for *such purposes*, or for any purpose, was ever commanded by Christ. They were pressed to maintain this, and positively refused. Why? It was a frank admission that they do not believe it. Neither do they believe that the rite can be sustained by the New Testament alone for any purpose. They were pressed to affirm it, but refused. Why? Only one reason. They know it contains no authority for it whatever. Nor do they believe that there is precept or example in the New Testament, or Word of God to support it, because this single issue was pressed upon them to maintain, and they refused. And there is but one conceivable ground for the refusal, *i. e.*, they were satisfied that neither Testament affords precept or example for infant baptism for any purpose, whether it be to regenerate them, or to admit them into the church without regeneration. I claim, then, and have the right to claim, that Dr. Ditzler and his friends, by refusing to affirm the above proposition, in this debate, have virtually admitted :

1. That Christ never *commanded* infants to be baptized for any purpose.

2. That the New Testament does not furnish satisfactory authority for the rite.

3. That there is neither an express precept for, nor clear example of, infant baptism in God’s Word.

These propositions may be considered eliminated from this

discussion. You need not expect to hear my opponent maintain them, and, mark my prophecy, you will not.

The question is, has already been impliedly, cut down to this, do the Old Testament—the teachings of Moses or the prophets afford some *analogy* or ground to infer that infant baptism, as practiced by the M. E. Church, is authorized?

And you have already noticed this. Eld. Ditzler has not, in the hour that he has spoken, claimed either a *command* or an *example* of infant baptism in the Old Testament, and he will not in this discussion, because it was also impliedly, admitted by his committee as instructed by himself, that the Old Testament affords neither command nor example for infant baptism, when they admitted that the *Bible* does not furnish them, by refusing to maintain such a proposition; for “the whole includes the sum of all its parts.”

If precepts or examples can be found in no part of the Bible, they cannot be found in the Old Testament. But he stands here to find *authority*, and he knows, what every man in this audience knows or should know, that *authority* in any government human or Divine, does not exist, and cannot be asserted or claimed without the *express command or enactment of the law-making power*, in, the Divine Head of the church. Now just one verse—just one word.

For any officer of this State or of these United States to maintain that he is *authorized* to perform any official or legal act, he must be able to produce a *legal warrant* and that in *express terms*, from the Courts or the acts of the Legislature. His right to perform the office he must derive from *express enactments* of the law-making power, and he *must be able to produce those enactments*. He has no right to *infer*, from what may have existed in this, or any *other* country that a specific thing should be done and that he has a right to do it, in the name of the government—he must be able to show a *specific law for it*, “in white and black,” and his own legal authority to execute that law.

Now, right *here*, at the outstart, do you bear me witness that in the most respectful terms, I do as it is my right, demand of Eld. Ditzler *one precept* for Infant baptism. in either Testament.

Here is God's word before us. If it authorizes Infant Baptism it contains somewhere *an express precept* for it, clear as the law for baptizing adults. Pedobaptists have been searching the Bible from the day the innovation was brought into practice of the professed church, and if there is a command or clear example, it must have been found. Eld. Ditzler has given thirty years to the diligent search for the law or example in God's word that authorizes it, and if it is in the Book, he certainly knows where it is, and can produce it in one minute as well as in one year.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, I appeal to you, if there is the least need of spending three days in settling *this* question? Can it not be done in one short speech as well as in one year, if indeed it is going to be settled by the authority of God's word—that is by its clear and undoubted precept—specific law, or the clear unquestionable practice of the Apostles and Apostolic churches as recorded in the New Testament? If such a precept or such examples are on record, Eld. Ditzler is informed of the fact; he knows where they are and he can produce them all in five minutes, and the question is settled. Ought he not to do so? Does not this occasion and your presence demand it at his hands? I am here to consider and receive such a law or such examples—just one will convince me, and I will, here, in your presence, renounce my Baptist principles. But, if Eld. Ditzler will not do so, if he will only continue as he has started out, to offer you only a groundless, and, therefore, imaginary analogy, drawn from the identity of the Jews, whether as the family of Abraham, or organized as a nation—with the visible church and kingdom of Christ—then you must see, feel and know that he has neither precept for, nor example of, and consequently no authority for Infant Baptism in the word of God. I shall claim, as I have a right to claim, that his very failure to produce express law, or clear examples of Infant Baptism by the churches the apostles planted—as a public confession on his part that he has no law or examples—nothing better than an inference, he will spend, in spite of all I can do, three days in preparing the ground, from the imaginary identity of the Jewish nation with

the church of Christ. It would to him, amount to nothing should I grant the identity—for there was no Infant Baptism in the Old Testament; and nothing like it—how, then, could he get it into the New?

Now of the truth of all I have said, Eld. Ditzler is fully aware. In the second head of his opening speech in the Wilkes Debate p. 15, he asserts that “the commission as found in Matt. is the only authority we have to baptize anybody.” THIS IS RECORDED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. This is the express command of Christ. I appeal then and here to this audience, were those not fair propositions that the Baptist Committee of this place submitted, when they proposed to settle this question by the New Testament? by the command of Christ?

But how has Eld. Ditzler met this question this morning? Has he planted himself upon *this law* to vindicate an authority in it, or render it to baptize infants in order to wash away the guilt of original sin or secure their spiritual quickening by the Holy Spirit and the strengthening and confirmation of their infant *faith* in Christ? Has he even opened the New Testament to read a precept for, or an example of, Infant Baptism? No, strangely no! but he has gone back four thousand years into the shadowy past, to explore “the weak and beggarly elements” of superseded dispensations, for the origin and model of a Christian church, when the New Testament alone is its *record* and its *rule*. I wish to pronounce and record a decided protest against such a course. It is misteaching, and a gross infliction upon the patience of this audience.

We might with as much reason, spend three days exploring the deserted borders of Moab and Edom, or the relics of the long-buried cities of Herculaneum and Pompeii, or the garden of Eden, or the plains of Chaldea, or the tents of Israel—four thousand years before the authority to baptize anybody was given; according to Eld. Ditzler’s own declaration, as it stands “graven with an iron pen and lead, in the rock forever.”

Now I am willing to rest this whole question, and include in it the 5th., upon a fair construction of that proposition, the meaning of which any common reader, any ordinarily intelligent child of fourteen, can determine as readily as any jurist

of the land. But Eld. Ditzler is not willing to decide this question by the letter and spirit of *that law*, but maintains that we must *infer* the action intended, and the subjects embraced in it by the *Jewish education of the apostles*, and the relation that, not infants in age, but children had stood to the Jewish nation or commonwealth, which he calls the church, in the past and abolished dispensations, and hence this long journey of four thousand years!

Did the Savior encourage the Scribes and Pharisees and Sadducees to interpret his teachings by *their* previously conceived opinions, *Jewish education, prejudice*, shades of religious thought, etc.? did he encourage this method of interpretation in Nicodemus?

Where does it appear from the records of the Old Testament, that when Jehovah appointed any branch of ritual worship, he left either the *subject* of it, or the *mode* of administration, to be *inferred* by the people, from the *relation* in which they stood to Himself, or from general moral precepts, or from any branch of his moral worship, or yet from any well known positive rite? This principle or rule, laid down by Elder Ditzler, is a pernicious one, and invented only to open the way for the introduction of the traditions of men, among the commands of Christ, and thereby make them of none effect.

I therefore affirm with all the earnestness of my nature and convictions of my soul, that the covenants made with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, or the children of Israel, have no more to do with the interpreting of the commission, or with the inferential support of infant baptism, than the covenant made with Noah concerning the deluge has. The most renowned scholars among the advocates of infant baptism have been frank enough to admit it.

I could rightly urge it as a point of order that the Elder's entire speech was out of order. What would it all amount to, suppose the Elder could prove what thousands of more able men before him have tried and failed to do, that there was a church in the garden, in the Ark, or in the "tents of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob," and in the wilderness, and that male

infants of the members of that church, were *Jews* born into it, and were therefore circumcised at eight days? Now would that prove that infants of Gentiles, of *all persons*, members or not, of saints and *infidels*, should have water sprinkled upon them at any age, eight days or eighty years, in order to secure their salvation?

Was that the purpose for which circumcision was administered to Jew boys? for it must have been, for the analogy to hold good. What then became of all those who died before they were eight days old? for it would have been in violation of the law to have circumcised before the babe was eight days old. And worse than all, what became of all the uncircumcised female infants, and adults also? Were *they* all damned? There is something right here fatal to his whole theory, even if he can show a law for baptizing female infants in the New Testament. This at least he must do, for they were not circumcised under the Old Testament dispensation.

Eld. Ditzler is laboring to prove it by *analogy*! Analogy! Has he exhausted his years on lexicons, and failed to read Butler? Don't he know that analogy never *proved* anything? The utmost it can do, is to establish a *probability*, an *inference*. But these will do my learned friend no good whatever. But since this argument from the analogy between a *pretended* church under the Old Dispensation and the church of Christ under the New, and the warrant supposed to be found in the Covenant of Circumcision (which is claimed to be the Covenant of Grace) has, among protestants become the main pillar and ground of Infant Baptism, I the more readily consent to follow Eld. Ditzler with the best light my intellect and reason, assisted by my understanding of God's word, through the dim shadows of the forty centuries of the past, before emerging into the clear light of the Gospel Dispensation to which alone Christian Baptism belongs.

My following will class under three heads:

I—REPLICATION.

II—EXPLICATION.

III—REFUTATION.

My first and main object will be to follow and reply to his

arguments, which are not his only, but R. Watson's, and indeed those of all modern Pedobaptists known to me. What he may not advance in his speeches I may refer to in his book.

2. I shall explain as best I may the Scriptures he may employ upon this occasion, to support this theory

3. And, as time may permit, though it does not devolve upon me, I shall endeavor to refute the entire theory of Infant Baptism as held by modern Pedobaptists, by demonstrating that the practice of Infant Baptism is not only contrary to the precept, but its whole purpose and design and effects are contrary to the genius, as they are subversive of the very fundamental principles of the Gospel of man's salvation, pernicious to the church and to the world, and endangering the salvation of the subject. I propose to couch my refutation in the form of short logical arguments, and to give my opponent ample time to attend to them, I will bring forward one or more at the close of each speech.

THE CHURCH.

The first objection, and it is a serious one, I lay to his course in his first speech is, *he does not define his terms—even those upon which he hinges his whole argument. And this is in violation of the rules of the debate, and the first principles that govern all logical reasoning. He has used the term Church, and an all-important word it is, for we may discuss here till the Master comes, and unless we define this one word, we shall have no clear conception of its meaning, we can come to no conclusion. Eld. Ditzler has been talking to you for a whole hour about a Christian Church, and he has left you in pitchy darkness, as to what a Christian Church is! There is not a man in this congregation, however richly endowed with intellect or blessed with culture, who can rise in his place and state what Eld. Ditzler himself regards as a Christian Church, from the definition he gives, for this simple reason the Elder has not given a definition; his statements do not amount to a definition. If he has given its kind, he has not given what logicians term its differentia, and this strikes me with astonishment, because I have understood that the Elder was a logician, as well as a linguist. He may, however.*

have sacrificed his logic to a single Syriac verb. I mean what I say and will illustrate my meaning.

If I am called upon to define a horse and say, "a horse is an *animal*," have I defined it? There are ten thousand animals that are not horses. A man is an animal but not a horse. If I further add, a horse is a four-footed animal, have I defined it so that you could tell it from an ox or an elephant? That's the trouble with his definitions; you cannot tell *his* church from a *nation* or a *mob*, from a *Masonic lodge* or a *Temperance Society*.

To say that the church of Christ, for that is the body we have under discussion—not an ecclesia of Greece—is a "crowd," is not defining it. To say it is "a mob" or "a congregation," is not defining it. To say it is a body of persons called out, or "called together," is not defining it; or even a body of Christians gathered into one place, or into an organized body, is not defining it. Such a body might possibly be a Masonic Lodge, or a Temperance Society, for there have been such bodies, every member a professed Christian. But neither a congregation of Christians, nor of angels, would be a church of Christ. The former, however, would make excellent *material* to constitute into a christian church. Who does not know that Christian baptism, and a scriptural church polity, constitute the essential *diferentia* of a Christian church, and has Eld. D. so much as mentioned them? He has talked learnedly, some may think—I should say quite unlearnedly—about Syriac and Chaldee, and has given you two words in Hebrew, the one translated a congregation, and the other an assembly; but he has failed to find one which the 70 Jews translated once by *ecclesia*, or that our English translators translate church. Why does he keep 4000 years away from the Greek term the Holy Spirit selected by which to indicate the church of Christ throughout the New Testament? It is the *usus loquendi* of the term by the Greeks themselves, and the modified use of the term throughout the New Testament, that we have to do with.

I will give Eld. D. the credit of giving elsewhere one of the essential *diferentia* of the Christian *ecclesia*, and I thank him for it. He says in his Debate with Wilkes, p. 21

"There is no such thing as a person being a member of the church of

God, in the true sense of that word, unless he is a child of God, **although** we may receive him and administer unto him **fleshly** ordinances [**as** circumcision or baptism], he is not a member of the church of God, [**visible** or **invisible**], unless he has been regenerated unto God; for it requires regeneration to bring a sinner into the family of God. Then it requires a man to be in Christ Jesus, to be a member of the church of God; it requires that he should be justified by Faith, in the Lord Jesus Christ."

This is *true*, but we may see that it is death by the sword to his whole system, for it shuts the door of the church, visible and invisible, in all ages, against infants, for they are not born regenerate. No morally unconscious infant ever exercised faith in Christ, and therefore, infants never, in any age, were members of the church of God, or the family of God, or the household, flock or fold of God, or the "true Israel," or of the "true circumcision," or of the "body of Christ," or to those God calls "my people." Is not this question again settled by his own admission? There is no avoiding the conclusion, even if he should find a score of Christian churches in the Old Testament. It is evident, and no one, not my opponent, will affirm, that any one should be baptized who is not qualified for church membership. But infants are not, says Mr. Ditzler. Therefore, &c. There is a place in the windings of the Mammoth Cave, which they call the Bottomless Pit, into which if a person falls, he is forever lost to the light of day. Eld. D. has unfortunately to his friends, stumbled into it, over this admission, and he never more will recover. Mark if he does. This is a sufficient answer to his whole hour's speech, and to all he can make during the three days allowed to the discussion of this proposition.

But what are the essential characteristics of a church of Christ, visible, for with no other body, if there be one, have we anything to do.

The Discipline of his own church, says:

The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered, according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.—Dis. p. 17.

This is quite a near approach to a proper definition. Mark two features of it:

1. It must be "a congregation of *faithful men*," i. e., believ-

ing men, justified by faith in Christ, regenerate in heart, not a mixed body, partly believers and partly un- or non-believers, partly justified and partly unjustified, a part regenerate and a part "the children of wrath even as others." It is evident to all that there was never such a congregation in the days of Abel or Abraham, of Moses or the prophets, never under the old *Jewish* dispensation, never until Christ called together such a body. It is evident that the M. E. organization, North or South, is not such a body, nor any society that admits infants and the professedly unregenerate to membership. This definition then, destroys the specious argument he is now making.

2. The second feature, "in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments"—baptism and the Lord's Supper—"are duly administered according to Christ's ordinance," *i. e.*, command or appointment. When and where in the Old Testament did Christ ordain Baptism and the Lord's Supper? When and where from the days of Abel to the days of Christ's incarnation, were Baptism and the Lord's Supper duly administered in any congregation of faithful men? Why these three days of argumentation to prove that there was such a church of Christ in the Old Testament, in which there were unregenerate, unjustified infants, which he says never were, are not, and can never be members? He must either give up his Discipline or his theory. They are utterly irreconcilable. Which will he do? Which will Methodists do, give up their Discipline, or Eld. Ditzler as a champion of it?

But what is a church of Christ?

The Episcopal prayer-book gives us the same definition as the above. Wesley copied it into the Discipline.

The Presbyterian Confession of Faith says:

II. The visible Church, which is also catholic, or universal under the gospel, (not confined to one nation as before under the law), consists of all those throughout the world, that profess the true religion, together with their children; and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation.—Con. Faith, ch. xxv, sec. 2.

This definition does not call for an organization, it does not require baptism; nor does it require that the members of it should be "faithful men," but provides that the larger num-

ber may be unregenerate, for it includes all the children, not infants in years merely, but *all the children of professing parents*, though they may be three score and ten!

I cannot accept this definition—Elder Ditzler cannot.

To ascertain the meaning of "Church of Christ" we must refer to two sources of information, since it is a Greek word which Christ used to designate his church, we must first go to the Greeks for their understanding of it; for the selecting Spirit chose a word that would convey a *general* idea to the Greek-speaking millions, who would read the sacred Scriptures. (2) We must then find its *usus loquendi* in the New Testament to learn if Christ in any respect *modified* its literal meaning when applied to an organized body of his followers, and if so, in what respect.

The noun *ecclesia* is compounded of the verb *kaleo*, to call, the preposition *ex*, out of, and it must therefore designate a body of persons called out of a multitude.

The Greeks were governed by three judicial bodies. The Senate of 500, the Ecclesia or Public Assembly and the *Dikastrics*—Jury Courts.

The Greek Ecclesia was a lawful assembly of qualified citizens, elected out of the multitude of people, for the transaction of public affairs. The members of it had to possess certain qualifications. When elected their names were enrolled or registered, and they were called together at stated times, by a qualified officer, were presided over, and their acts duly recorded by a clerk or scribe. [See Smith's *His. of Greece* p. 98.]

Archbishop Trench says:

"We have *ekklesia* in three distinct stages of meaning—heathen, the Jewish and the Christian. In respect to the first, *ekklesia*, as all know, was the lawful assembly in a free Greek city of all those possessed of the rights of citizenship for the transaction of public affairs. That they were *summoned* is expressed in the latter part of the word. That they were *summoned out of* the whole population, a select portion of it, including neither the populace, nor yet strangers, nor those who had forfeited their civic rights, this is expressed in the first. Both the *calling* and the *calling out* are moments to be remembered, when the word is assumed into a higher Christian sense, for in them the chief part of its peculiar adaptation to its august uses lies."

We see that being a legal legislative assembly, duly registered as such, it was an Ecclesia at all times, whether in session or adjourned, as is the House of Commons of England, or the House of Representatives of the United States, bodies to which the Grecian Ecclesia was closely analogous—it was a permanent body.

An ordinary, or extraordinary assemblage of a *multitude* could no more be called an Ecclesia in Greece, than it could be the House of Commons in England. Nor could a lawless “mob” be called an Ecclesia any more properly than it could be called the House of Representatives in this country.

The members of the Ecclesia voted either by a show of hands, or by ballot.

Says the Editor of North American Cyclopaedia, p. 736 :

“Besides the legislative powers of the Assembly, Ecclesia, it could make inquisition into the conduct of Magistrates, and in turbulent and excited times, exercised a power resembling that of impeachment, as in the cases of Demosthenes and Phocion.”

It will be seen that all matters that affected the public interest and the welfare of the people, civil or religious, came under its cognizance.

The meetings of the Ecclesia were at first held in the Agora, but afterwards in the great theatre of Dionyseus, and in the theatre at Munychia—as the regular sessions of our legislatures are held in the capitol buildings of our States.

By reference to Act xix., we see that Luke says that upon the uproar in the city, the “Ecclesia gathered,” not a lawless mob, for he distinguishes it from the *demos*—populace—and from *ochlos*—an irregular crowd. It will be noticed that this *Ecclesia* gathered with one accord into the *theatre*, the appointed and legal gathering place of this body. Had it been a lawless mob, it would have had no right, nor would it have been permitted to assemble in the *theatre*, nor would it have thought of such a gathering place. The multitude followed the Ecclesia into the theatre, and, by preferring, some, one charge, and some, another, confused the Ecclesia, and it could ascertain nothing definite to act upon.

Now, the Ecclesia of Christ is a body of persons elected

and called out from the world at large, separated and distinguished from it by regeneration of heart. Christ says of the members of it: "Ye are not of this world, but I have chosen you *out of the world*." John xv. 19.

The names of the members of the Christian Ecclesia, are duly registered, not only upon the records of the body itself, below, but "written in heaven."

Every member must be introduced formally into the Ecclesia, upon a profession of personal faith in the Trinity, and the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, which profession is made in the act of immersion in water. See Commission Matt. xxviii; John iii. 5; also, Heb. iv. 14; and 1. Cor. xii. 13. For in one spirit—"in the spirit of childlikeness of obedience and love, "we are all immersed into one body"—which is said by the apostle in the same chapter, to be a church—"and have all been made to drink into one spirit," we have imbibed into our very souls the spirit of love and obedience. By this act of immersion we are introduced into, and finally qualified, to be active members of the Ecclesia of Christ. This is the first modification of the Grecian Ecclesia—it is a body of *regenerated* and properly *baptized* persons. The Church of Christ is not a *legislative*, but only an *executive* body. It can make, repeal, or change no laws, but its duty is to execute those already enacted by its only head and lawgiver, Jesus Christ. Like the Grecian Ecclesia, all the members are upon an *equality*—all are *brethren*. There are no authoritative rulers. All the ministers are the equals of each other, and rule as presiding officers, according to the law of Christ. "Call no man master." Therefore, we define a Christian Ecclesia—Church—to be a body of believers in Christ, who have been Scripturally immersed upon a profession of their previous regeneration, and faith in Christ, associated by covenant in the faith and fellowship of the gospel, observing the ordinances of Christ; governed only by this law, and exercising the gifts, rights and privileges invested in them by his Word. Such a body is alone entitled to be regarded or called a Christian church. All can see there can be no infants in this church, any more than in Elder Ditzler's church of

regenerated persons, and every man and woman, and child, in this audience, who has read the Old Testament, knows that there never was such a visible organized body as this from the days of Abel, to the days of John the Baptist.

Now, Mr. President, I protest against the illogical and unscholarly course of Elder Ditzler in continually calling something "the church of God," before he has either defined what he means by the term, or proved that one existed in the garden, ark, or family of Abraham. He is constantly committing the fallacy styled by logicians, *petitio principii*, a begging of the question—taking the very thing for granted that he is first required to prove. He has assumed that there has been a church from the annunciation of the promised seed in the garden until this day, essentially the same under all dispensations, but he has not offered one word or syllable of proof, nor pretended to.

I will state his theory as I understand it.

1. That the Church of God "existed thousands of years before circumcision or *any carnal ordinance*"—the same in its designs and principles, and in unbroken continuity, now as it is to-day. See his Debate with Wilkes, p. 17.

2. That infants, all infants, enjoyed membership in this Church.

3. The first ordinance ever introduced was administered to infants.

4. That the Jewish nation was the true Church of Christ, and infants were members of it and enjoyed all its privileges and immunities and that the Church was not changed under the new dispensation. Now his language seems to be "therefore"—his language should be—it is *probable*, in the absence of any law to the contrary—that infants should be continued in the church to-day, but his conclusions are, infants are members of the Christian Church now—and that it devolves upon me to show that the Jewish Church was destroyed—and its *infant* membership abrogated by God's own specific and direct command!

From four assumptions mere *inferences* which he has not

proved and cannot prove, he draws an absolute and positive conclusion! Is this the science of logical accuracy?

I answer it all in a general way with a sentence. From ten thousand inferences, you can infer *nothing*—not even an *inference*. From the best and nicest analogies you can only infer a probability and there is no place for inference or probabilities in this discussion, but for *proofs*. The question concerns a positive institution, and we must produce positive law—a thus saith the Lord—therefore let the opponents of Infant Baptism show where this church is destroyed.

To the last demand, I reply, the gentleman need not call upon me to put infants out of the New Testament church, because he has himself declared they were never in it. Remember his declaration: "There is no such thing as a person being a member of the church of God, in the true sense of that word, unless he is a child of God." "Unless regenerated unto God." "Justified by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ." But for the sake of this audience, and those who may read this discussion, I propose to refute the theory, by exploding the inferences specifically, and showing you that the practice of Infant Baptism, as observed in the M. E. Church, contravenes the very genius and subverts the very system of Christianity.

1. That "the church of God existed one thousand years before any carnal ordinances." The first carnal ordinance that we have any account of being observed, was the sacrifice of Abel, offered by faith, and sacrificial offerings for sin accepted of God, must have been appointed by God. All theologians agree in this. See A. Clarke, *in loco*. But was this appointed for, or administered to, an infant? Let any one answer. But

2. *The church was in the Garden of Eden*, and the model and mother of all future ones! If so, it consisted of two sinful and unregenerate persons, under the curse of God. Would these constitute "a congregation of faithful men?" Were the ordinances that Christ commanded, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, duly administered? But if it was the first and model church, there were no infants in it! So the staple to which

my opponent's chain is attached, is crushed and falls. No church nor infant rite in the first dispensation.

3. Was there a church in the second dispensation. After our first parents were driven from the garden, God instituted a worship, by sacrifices, and in connection with these the promise of salvation through faith in Christ, as the coming Redeemer, must have been proclaimed to Adam and his family, for we read that "through faith Abel made a more acceptable sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts; and by it he being dead, yet speaketh." Heb. xi, 4. Now because he was righteous, must we conclude that he was in the church of God? If so, so far as the inspired record goes, and we have no right to go beyond it, *he was the only living being* at this time, who was justified by faith, for, if Adam or Eve had been believers, being such prominent characters, would not inspiration have mentioned the fact? Then it follows when Cain slew Abel, he prevailed against the Church of God, and abolished it, and by one fell stroke blotted it out of existence! That club was the fatal instrument of death, not only to Abel, but to the very foundation upon which the whole system of Infant Baptism rests.

Eld. Ditzler maintains that God had a church in Eden, that Abel was a worshipper in it, and that from the day it was set up, it has never ceased to have existence, and has been the *same* under every dispensation, or we must admit that God changes! What will he now do? Give up his false theory—the ghost of which is crying from the ground—or will he give up his God? He is bound as a Christian man to give up one or the other. I assure you if I could be convinced that the church of Christ had ever been prevailed against by either its corruption or destruction, I would be compelled to surrender my Bible with my faith. But in Abel's church there were no infants, which fact is fatal to the theory of Pedobaptism. When and where was it set up again?

But we are told by the advocates of Infant Baptism that the church was in the Ark with Noah, and the theory of my opponent forces him upon this position he claims a continuous

church from the garden, he even says that the church of God existed 1000 years before any fleshly or carnal rite—and Noah's, and Abel's sacrifice were carnal ordinances, and therefore, his *theory* carries the church beyond time into eternity itself!!

But grant that the church, the first and model church was in the Ark. Let us open the doors and look in upon it and see of whom it was composed. If any one had saving faith, it was Noah. The record mentions his faith, but the faith of no other one. Then if his family constituted the model church, only one member out of eight was a believer, but alas, for Pedobaptism, there was not an infant in it! And this my friend claims is the model of the church of which he is a member and stands here to advocate!!

Thus you have seen all the evidence there is of a church for the first 1656 years—but if church, one thing is certain, *there were no infants in it* for 1656 years, which is peculiarly fatal to his theory. Trace it on down for 2106 years to Abraham's day and the Covenant of Circumcision, and still find no trace of an infant!! If an infant was ever brought into it, it must have been by some new covenant and new law which Eld. Ditzler, with all his ingenuity and learning can never *find*, nor *invent* without detection. Why need I reply longer to him or expose the groundlessness of his system? Why may I not claim the question as settled in my favor, and set down and permit him to consume the two remaining days in the vain endeavor to find a sound piece of timber in the wreck and ruin of his demolished system? Have I not broken the very staple of it, and crushed into dust every link of his chain for nearly 2000 years? It is known to every man that no chain, however massive, is **stronger than its weakest link, break but one,**

“Tenth or tenth thousand, breaks the chain!”

But as this discussion is designed alike for the instruction of those who read it as well as those who hear, I will follow him on down into the wilderness of Sin and Sinai.

What do you conclude with reference to three of the inferences upon which he builds his theory?

Take the definition of a church given in the Discipline my opponent is sworn "to mind not mend," if you will not take mine, and decide if there was a visible organization of "faithful men" and regenerate infants in those ages.

There were no infants in his Edenic Church.

There were no infants in Abel's Church.

There were no infants and only one righteous man in the Ark or on the earth when we enter upon the third Dispensation!

Refutation.

I will first construct a logical argument in Elder Ditzler's own language in refutation of his own theory, and his own church, which he can never answer, *but must respect*, if he has any respect for his own statements.

ARG. No. I.

1. There is no such thing as a person—this means any one, young or old if it means anything—being a member of the church of God in the true sense of the word—and this means invisible as well as visible, unless he has been regenerated unto God. * * "For it requires regeneration to bring a sinner into the family of God." * * It requires a man to be in Christ Jesus, to be a member of the church of God; it requires that he should be justified by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ."—*J. Ditzler, in Debate with Wilkes, p. 21.*

2. But the infants of the Jews, as well as of Christians, in every age are unregenerated and unjustified, and the "children of wrath even as others."

3. Therefore they never were and never can be, members of the church of Christ.

ARG. No. II.

1. Those organizations that admit unregenerate children or adults as members, cannot be regarded as churches of Christ in any true sense of the word.

2. But all Pedobaptist organizations do admit unregenerate children to membership.

3. Therefore Pedobaptist organizations cannot be regarded as churches of Christ.—[*Time out.*

DR. DITZLER'S SECOND SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—The points my worthy opponent sought to make, will naturally fall in before me in the course laid out, and his objections will all be met in course. Hence we pursue our chain of argument begun in our Saturday's address.

We saw the church *one*. It was developed out of the promise or covenant of redemption in Christ. Christ was its "founder and its consummator"—Hebrews xii. 1, 2, as expounded in our first address. Christ "lead his people all the days of old." They were "one with him"—his brethren. We saw that Christ was incarnated, and solidified, "gathered together" "the lost sheep—straying, scattered ones—of the house of Israel." So all prophecy had declared he would do. They formed a multitude before his crucifixion. Israelites, indeed, in whom no guile existed all along through the darkest and most trying times of Israel's depression.

We saw that the church's *existence* and connection or identity never did consist of its ordinances or ritualistic services in any age of the world. This is very important. What old dreamy writers, who dote over the dreams of mystics, write on such a subject, interests me but little. God's church never did depend on its ritual. That changed repeatedly by God's legislation, under the same dispensations, in different dispensations, were suspended, enlarged, abridged, broken often as to their order and administrator, as the Bible abundantly shows. But these things never affected the perpetuity—the *oneness* of God's people or church. These facts will come up under another proposition, and need not be elaborated here. The truth is, Jesus Christ is the unity of his people. As to the olive tree, we say *it is the church*—the remnant preserved, when Christ came, to whom Gentile converts were added, even as to them the 3000 on Pentecost converted from among

scoffers and those who had rejected, crucified him, were added, and others thereafter. This fact is further seen in Gal. iv. 31 :

"21. Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law ?

"22. For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a free woman.

"23. But he *who was* of the bondwoman was born after the flesh ; but he of the free woman *was* by promise.

"24. Which things are an allegory : for these are the two covenants ; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar.

"25. For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children.

"26. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all.

"For it is written, Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not ; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not : for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath a husband.

"28. Now we brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise.

"29. But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him *that was born* after the Spirit, even so *it is* now.

"30. Nevertheless what saith the Scripture ? Cast out the bondwoman and her son : for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the free woman.

"31. So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free.

Paul had just shown that "they who are of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham." Gal. iii. 9. Then he farther adds :

"15. Brethren, I speak after the manner of men : Though *it be* but a man's covenant, yet *if it be* confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto.

"16. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many ; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ.

"17. And this I say, *that* the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect.

"18. For if the inheritance *be* of the law, *it is* no more of promise : but God gave *it* to Abraham by promise.

"19. Wherefore then *serveth* the law ? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made ; *and it was* ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator."

Here Paul shows that *the covenant* at Sinai, the covenant represented by Hagar, which "engendereth to bondage," was

not of promise—not of faith—and was *four* hundred and thirty years later than that made with Abraham, “the father of us all.” The covenant of redemption was that made with Abraham. It was “*confirmed* before of God *in Christ*.” Gal. iii. 17. “The *inheritance*” is of promise—not of the law. All this was done,

“14. That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.”

Hence all believers are one in Christ—of the same church.

“29. And if ye *be* Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.”

IDENTITY OF THE CHURCH.

“The law of commandments contained in ordinances (Eph. xi. 15) he took out of the way, nailing it to the cross.” The law of commandments “contained in ordinances” “*was added* because of transgressions *till the* Seed (Christ) should come,” (Gal. iii. 19), being *imposed* till the time of *reformation*,” (Heb. ix. 10). Christ had become surety to Abraham for the Father that the *promises* should be fulfilled—“By so much was Jesus made a *surety of a better testament*”—(Heb. viii. 22). Hence this *removal*—taking away the ritualistic elements *that never had* encumbered the church till the Mosaic day, necessitated by the effects of centuries of slavery in Egypt, those “carnal ordinances imposed till the time of reformation” fell with the rending of the veil. That system was a *parenthesis*. It was temporary. The church existed *before* it. It existed during the formation of these ceremonies—during the suspension of them *in part* and, at times, in whole—during their variations, irregularities whereby wars, usurpations, conquests, etc., etc., they were most irregularly administered in large part—during the days of the Daniel’s or Elijah’s, it existed. The law never was “of faith”, Gal. iii. 11, 12. Yet, from Abel down, all God’s people were saved by faith, Heb. xi. entire, Rev. iii. 28, 31; iv. 1–14 entire. Hence Abraham is “the father of us *all*,” (v. 16). Hence “the bondwoman,” that is “the Sinaitic” “law of commandments contained in ordinances” that “made nothing perfect” (Heb. vii. 19), being only “a carnal com-

mandment" (v. 16,) determined and necessitated by the Aaronic priesthood, (vii. 12). Hence the bondwoman and her son were "*cast out*," "*cut off*," "*fell away*." Hence we are children of the free woman—being children of Abraham by faith. To the same effect speaks Paul, Eph. ii :

13. "But now, in Christ Jesus, ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ.

14. "For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us.

15. "Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, *even* the law of commandments *contained* in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, *so making* peace;

16. "And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby :

17. "And came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh.

18. "For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father.

19. "Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God ;

20. "And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone."

There is no "new church" organized here—just the reverse. This renovated condition of society is called "new" just as a renovated soul is a "new creature," a renovated heart is a new heart, and a new spirit," so often named by the same apostle. The bringing in of so many Gentiles, with the great breadth the church assumed, gave a new era to her course. But we must remember that those who would make the "new man" here mean, that *bringing* in the Gentiles implied that out of *the bad elements* he was to organize *a new* church, not only contradict all fact, all Scripture and reason, but contradict the plainest records of the New Testament ; not for *eight years after Pentecost* were the Gentiles brought in, as all agree, and the Christian Jews *brought them* in. See Acts x. entire, xiii. entire and xv. entire where the Gentiles are first converted and laws for them given by the Jewish body. The fact that in all the assaults made upon Paul, Acts xxiii. 3, xxiv. 11–32, xxv. 8–9, xxvi. 2, 8, it was never charged by those so anxious to prejudice his case that he, even the apostle of the Gentiles, sought to originate

a new church, a new system, a new religion, is confirmatory of all this beyond all dispute. If a new religion, a new church had been taught, he could not have answered this. Not only so, but the apostolic church practiced circumcision till near, if not up to the end of that century.

The *identity*—*oneness*—ENTITY of God's church is established. Its principles are one—its God One, its Christ one, its Truth one, its objects one. *Not* analogy—not *likeness*, but ENTITY, we have proved. The principles of ALL dispensations are—love God with all the heart—our neighbor as ourselves. (Deut. vi. 4, 5; Mark xii. 28–34; Rom. xiii. 13; xiv. 17–18.)

It is established. All admit infants were members of this church.

Dr. Carson says of the Jewish Israel: "*Was the church into which its members were born*, the same etc., 233. Nay, he said, "Is the Christian church that rejected the great body of the Jewish nation, the same with the Jewish church etc., 233. "Was the church that admitted every stranger to its passover etc.,? "As the church of Israel was the church of God, typical of his true church etc." 234.

We next show that *Infants* were members in that church, and not only circumcised at eight days old, but *baptized*. Deut. xxix. 10–12, shows their "little ones" of all ages were included, Gen. xviii. 19, shows the "household" was included, Num. iii. 27–28, shows those a month old and upwards are there included in the religious charge of the church.

Joel i. 15–17:

15 ¶ "Blow the trumpet in Zion, sanctify a fast, call a solemn assembly;

16. "Gather the people, sanctify the congregation, assemble the elders, gather the children, and those that suck the breasts: let the bridegroom go forth of his chamber, and the bride out of her closet.

17. "Let the priests, the ministers of the LORD, weep between the porch and the altar, and let them say, Spare thy people, O LORD, and give not thine heritage to reproach, that the heathen should rule over them; wherefore should they say among the people, Where is their God?"

Here the tenderest age of infancy—"those that suck the breast" are recognized as members of the church. How did they sanctify the congregation—*ekklesia*—*the church*; Heb. ix. 18; Num. xix. 13; viii. 7 tell us. [They baptized the church.]

Infants were among the parties specially named. They had *membership*. We have *no need* to prove that they are entitled to baptism—all admit *membership* carries *with* it baptism. Membership is what we prove—the greater including the less. We read in Matthew xviii.

“At the same time came the disciples unto Jesus saying, Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven ?

2. “And Jesus called a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them.

3. “And said, Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.

4. “Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven.

5. “And whoso shall receive one such little child in my name receiveth me.

6. “But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and *that* he were drowned in the depth of the sea.”

Here it is clearly taught that “little children” are in the kingdom of heaven.

1st. Notice v. 1, “who is greatest *in the* kingdom of heaven? is *the* point before the audience. That was *the* question.

2d. A child so young that it represented innocence—not old enough to be presumed as yet to be guilty of anything needing faith or conversion, to become innocent, is the party set forth.

3d. Adults have to *become converted* and *become as* little children “to enter into the kingdom.”

4th. It was in answer to “who is greatest *in the* kingdom’ the child is called.

5th. We are to receive such little child *in Christ’s* name, v. 5. To this add Matt. xix. 13–15:

“13 Then were there brought unto him little children, that he should put *his* hands on them, and pray ; and the disciples rebuked them.

14. But Jesus said, Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me ; for of such is the kingdom of heaven.

15. And he laid *his* hands on them, and departed thence.

Luke xviii. 15, calls them “infants (*taphedia*) which interchanges v. 16 with “little children (*ta paidia*). “Of *such*

[INFANTS] is the kingdom of God." In the light of such declarations he adds. "17. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child shall in no wise enter therein." Here again it is in connection with how adults are to "enter in," who have transgressed, rejected Christ, that infants are held up as *the standard of qualification* for *adult* entrance. Amid such declarations it is declared "*Of such* is the kingdom of heaven." They are members in it.

This is the more pointed, if possible, when we remember that the Jews *had always* had their infants in church relation with them. We must remember these words were by a *Jew to Jews*, who talked to him *before* this *familiarly* about the kingdom of heaven. That *they* all had their infants recognized as in the same.

Not only so, but, as A. Campbell says, Ch. Baptism, p. 335, and debated with Rice :

"The believing Jews, down to the end of the New Testament history, circumcised their children. Paul publicly declared, by an overt act, that he *had not* COMMANDED them *to desist* from circumcising their children."

Hence this circumcision of *infants* in the Apostolic church, long years after Pentecost, answers *four* points. 1st. It proves that the old church was not abolished. 2d. That no new church was organized on radically different grounds. 3d. That, *any way*, *infants* were still in the church, recognized as such. 4th. That though this is so—that infants were constantly *circumcised* during the whole period of Apostolic history, *yet not a case of it is named—no recorded case*. This should hush the cry about "a recorded case of infant baptism in the New Testament." 5th. If it required a *special command* to *desist* from *any* practice that late in Apostolic history, (Acts xv. and xxi.) why not equally so as to infant membership and baptism?

Here then we have the infants in the church. How will he get them out? It will do no good to quote where Doctor this one or that one had said or written very silly, or foolish, or absurd, or contradictory things. That is not the issue. Is it in accordance *with the Scriptures*? *That is the point*.

In accordance with these facts, we read Acts xvi. 15, of Lydia—

"15. And when she was baptized, and her household, she besought us,

saying, If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house, and abide *there*. And she constrained us."

And xvi:

"32. And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house.

33. And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed *their* stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, straightway.

34. And when he had brought them into his house, he set meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God with all his house."

I Cor. i:

"16. And I baptized also the household of Stephanas: besides, I know not whether I baptized any other."

I Cor. xvi:

"15. I beseech you, brethren, (ye know the house of Stephanas, that it is the firstfruits of Achaia, and *that* they have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints.)

I ask now: 1st. There being some eight "household baptisms" recorded in the New Testament, is it likely they were *all* destitute of infants? 2d. Are we not authorized by these cases to baptize such households?

It is answered, the household of Stephanas "addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints"—waiting on God's ministers, etc., hence no infants. To this we reply: 1st. They could have grown up in the years since their baptism to assist older ones in service. 2d. Such language does not at all imply that such as were too young for such work would be included, whereas from the whole history of religion, they would be; see especially Num. iii. 27, 28, where infants "a month old and upwards" were charged with a ministry. The jailor "rejoiced, believing in God (*panoiki*) with all his house"—the word *panoiki* being *an adverb describing* how he rejoiced—qualifying the verb, only *he* rejoiced—verb in the singular number. The old *Peshito* reads "Lydia and *her children*" were baptized—"the jailor was baptized and *all his children* (*kulhun*).

All parties are settled in the fact that infant baptism is established when *infant membership*, its right, is settled. This we have now done beyond all power of refutation. I need do nothing now but hurl back the onset of the opposition—foil, meet the objections urged against it. This is all I need do, though other and powerful additional arguments will still be adduced.

Dr. Graves wishes this question confined to the New Testament. Why not confine repentance, justification, atonement, Christ's divinity, to the New Testament as well. How can you understand the New without the Old?

All he has to read about baptism administered as a means of grace, to quicken, etc., amounts to nothing. 1st. No Methodist teaches or believes that. 2d. We are discussing whether it is taught in *the Bible*, not in men's creeds or essays.

He urges that if it represents nothing within, it is a lie. He believes that baptism not only represents things *within*, but things *without*. So he is met there. Circumcision represented things *within*, we know, for of it prophets and apostles declare its *inward* import. Rom xi, 28, 29, He is not a Jew who is one outwardly; *neither is that circumcision which is outward, in the flesh*; but he is a Jew who is one *inwardly*; and *circumcision is that of THE HEART, in the Spirit.*" See also, Col. ii, 11; Rom. iv, 11. It was "a sign, a seal of the *righteousness of faith.*" Yet it was administered at *eight days old*, though Paul says it was "*of the heart.*"

He believes it had not the *use* and *import* to the infant of eight days, but served such ends when it grew to comprehend its use and symbolic import. So of baptism.

He reads our discipline, the so-called Wesley Tract, to prove that Methodists teach that in baptism infants are delivered from the wrath of God. He knows, or ought to know that we never did in any age or country so teach. To force a meaning on those phrases, which our article on baptism in the Discipline, the context, and all our standards show we never held, but so far from that, despise, reject them, is not my idea of fair debate. It little becomes those who till but recently taught that infants were in hell, and only abandoned it under the effects of our preaching to bring such charges. We will notice those matters more fully in due time.

He quotes Limborch, Bledsoe, etc., that "there is no proof that the apostles ever baptized an infant." They say not so. They say there is no "*express mention*" of it in the New Testa-

ment; that is, there is no place in the New Testament where *so many words it records that an infant was baptized*. This amounts to nothing.

1. It is nowhere recorded that John the Baptist ever baptized a *woman*, a boy, a girl—you baptize *all such*.

2. It is nowhere said or recorded that the twelve apostles ever baptized (1) a woman, (2) boy, (3) girl, (4) or *man in all their ministry!* So, to be consistent you should *never* baptize *any* of these classes. As to Paul's record, we will examine it hereafter, he not being of "the twelve."

3. It is nowhere recorded or told us in the New Testament that an infant was circumcised in all the Apostolic days. Yet we know, and all agree, that they *were* circumcised *daily*—every day of the world, more or less.

4. It is nowhere "expressly" said or recorded, or hinted, that *the twelve Apostles were ever baptized*.

5. Nor that the *seventy* were.

6. Nor that the one hundred and twenty disciples were.

7. Nor that John the Baptist was *himself* baptized.

This will do. This crushes the popular objections *in toto*.

You urge that we justify, prove infant baptism by inference. Well, suppose that be so. Do you not rely on "*inference*" for "*immersion*?" You know you do. YOU BAPTIZE ADULTS SOLELY ON INFERENCE. You *infer* from *your* expositions of Scripture that certain qualifications exist, and *all* by inference. A fact can as perfectly rest on legitimate *inference* as on *actual, express declaration*.

But he says the church was founded on circumcision. I have overwhelmingly showed the reverse, and until he assails my crushing facts, I can pass *that* point. What *was* the remnant? he asks. I showed elaborately. What he means by Jews translating the word (*kehal*) by *ekklesia* *once*, I know not, since it is translated by it constantly.

Was the *Olive* tree, Abraham, or Christ? he asks. Say yourself, and either position destroys *your* theory and sustains me.

As for those *sylogisms*—beginning the question each time—*taking for granted the very thing in dispute*, why that is anything but *logic*. To parade syllogisms on that order is to satirize a logic. But enough here. If the learned Doctor *has arguments*, let them be adduced, and we will meet them. I have nothing to do now but to dash back the billows of opposition, hurl back the missiles of the archer. He cannot break the force of truth. My position stands as a column of *granite*—imperishable, indestructible in its nature, majestic in its strength, resting on the deeply-bedded rock of eternal truth. THE CHURCH OF GOD IS ONE FOREVER—INFANTS ARE IN IT.—*[Time Out.]*

DR. GRAVES' SECOND REPLY

Replication.

MR. PRESIDENT:—Scientists tell us that the first phase in which our earth appeared, before the creative or re-forming fiat went forth, was a nebulous—a thin impalpable gaseous state. Now with all due respect to my distinguished opponent, it does seem to me that his argument for authority to baptize infants, is in its nebulous—*gaseous* state. If he has sent forth his creative or formative fiat, the material has not given any signs of obedience to it, to assume shape and tangibility. I am waiting patiently for the first show of authority in God's Word for the administration of Christian Baptism to unconscious babes, for the purposes, Eld. Ditzler and the Society in this place administer it—i. e., to wash away the guilt of original sin, and as an effectual means of regeneration, and reception into the church. He has, thus far, been discussing altogether another subject—i. e., whether there was a visible Christian Church in the Old Testament, and whether it was identical with the visible kingdom of Christ extant to-day. Suppose I grant that there was, what would he gain by the admission? Can he show that the ordinances—Baptism and The Lord's Supper—were instituted by Christ or observed in that church? Evidently not. Can he anywhere find where, by express command, the Divine Lawgiver commanded these rites to be substituted for any existing rites, or that they should be added to the existing rites of an existing organization? If he can, he will do what no man before his time has been able to do.

I propose in this speech to notice more specifically the positions to which he is committing himself and his people.

1. He defines the Church of God in which there have been infants in all ages—as

ALL THE SAVED BY *Grace in all ages.*

This is what is called by Theologians—"the Church invisible.

With such a body, if there be one, we have nothing to do in this debate. No living infant ever was or can be in *that* body. That body has no ordinances of any kind. We have to do with visible, local churches that have ordinances.

2. He affirms that all infants are born in a state of salvation.

3. He affirms that all infants are born members of the church—"God's family," flock, yea, household, church, without the need of faith or regeneration!" Now I must here impeach him for inveighing against the Articles of his own Discipline, that he has sworn on bended knee to his Bishop to believe and teach, to "*mind* and not mend." His Discipline defines a church to be "a congregation of faithful men," and not these alone, but in this congregation of believers "the pure word of God must not only be preached," but "the sacraments, baptism and the Supper duly administered."

Eld. Ditzler affirms that infants are born pure, free from the guilt and consequences of original sin—in a saved state, but the VII Article of his Discipline teaches the very opposite of this;

VII.—OF ORIGINAL OR BIRTH-SIN.—Original Sin standeth not in the following of Adam (as the Pelagians do vainly talk), but it is the corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and of his own nature inclined to evil, and that continually.

Elder Ditzler affirms that infants are *born* into the church, while the whole office for baptism in the Discipline proceeds on the doctrine that by baptism they are received into the church, and without it no infant, any more than adult, can enter into the Kingdom of God. I will read a little under the head of "Ministration of Baptism to Infants:"

"Dearly beloved, forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin. and that our Savior Christ saith, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God: I beseech you to call upon God the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that of his bounteous mercy he will grant to *this child* that which by nature *he* cannot have: that *he* may be baptized with water and the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ's holy Church, and be a *lively member* of the same.

Then shall the minister say,

Let us Pray.

Almighty and everlasting God, we beseech thee for thine infinite mercies, that thou wilt look upon *this child*: wash *him* and sanctify *him* with Holy Ghost; that *he*, being delivered from thy wrath, may be received into the ark of Christ's Church."

Now Elder Ditzler has sprinkled many a babe, and in every instance he has told the parents of it, that they by the act of baptism caused their infant to be introduced into the church. I read on page 205 :

"Then the minister addressing the parents, or others presenting the child, *shall say*, 'In causing this child TO BE BROUGHT BY BAPTISM INTO THE CHURCH OF CHRIST,' " etc.

Thus we see in the very outstart, Elder Ditzler takes positions utterly subversive of the articles and of the *ritual* of his Discipline and his church! Now I want you all to notice this. Elder Ditzler came here to maintain and prove that infant baptism as practiced by his church, is authorized by the Word of God, and in his very first speech, he has affirmed that the teachings of his Discipline are not sustained by the Word of God!!

Has he not made a bad start? *He has openly repudiated the teachings of his Discipline!* Which will Methodists hold to, their Discipline or Eld. Ditzler? One or the other *must* be repudiated.

I do not know that I understood Eld. Ditzler's position in his first speech, if I did, he affirmed that the Jewish Synagogue in the Old Testament was identical with the Church of Christ in the New! While this has no support in the Bible, and can find no favor in a Christian's mind, it is exceedingly fatal to his cause for there never was a Synagogue that had infant members in it.

He has thus far confounded the "church invisible" with the *visible*, the Jewish nation with the Christian church and the Jewish Synagogue with the Christian church, and finally the world at large with the church. He quoted to prove that there are sinners in the church. "Let both grow together," etc. Christ distinctly said that "the field was the world" and not the Church in which the tares were to grow.

He strongly deprecated, in his first speech, quoting the authorities of eminent scholars to support our position, and twice before he closed, he quoted a list of *Pedobaptist* authors to support *Pedobaptist* views! Of what weight are such interested witnesses, in their own cause? When I quote authorities, they will be *his own witnesses*, testifying to the unscripturalness and untenableness of his positions, and I shall have a large use for these. When an advocate can win his case at law by the witnesses of the opposing party, it is a proof that he has a very clear case. Elder Ditzler will use only interested witnesses—men on the same side with himself, and I shall overthrow his positions by the testimony of his own witnesses alone.

Elder Ditzler has occupied a large amount of his time, so far, in proving that there was a goodly number of Christians in every age, from Abel down. I wish to state again, that I do not deny this glorious fact, but that I do assert that they were not separated from others by any visible organization or ordinances—this is the simple issue. The Jewish nation nor local synagogue, was composed of the professedly regenerate.

Let it be borne in mind, that Elder Ditzler holds and teaches that Hebrews xi. 25: "To the General Assembly and Church of the first born," refers to the church invisible, the aggregate number of the saved in all ages. The Word of God is directly against this, as I will prove, when I come to examine the true relation of the Jewish Commonwealth to the visible church of Christ—but bear this in mind. He affirms in his first speech, that the church was developed out of God's Covenant of Redemption, etc. Will he state explicitly when and to whom, and where the Covenant of Grace or Redemption was first announced, and so announced as to bring the church into existence.

Another large part of his two speeches refers to matters that belong to the next dispensation, and have no reference whatever to this—to the future return of the Jews to their own land, to the second coming of Christ, to the setting up of the Royal House of David, with David's divine son and Lord of

his throne forever, and strange to say, quotes these events as the re-establishing of the Christian church during the present Gospel dispensation ! He evidently has no clear conception of the significancy of most of the passages he has quoted, for he intermixes, confuses and confounds them to the bewilderment of his people.

In the regular course of my explication, I will explain the covenant made with David, and then all can see what is meant by building again the tabernacle of David that is fallen down—not the church of Christ in any sense. Before replying further I respectfully ask him to explain definitely, what he means by these terms :

1. The remnant that shall return.
2. The good Olive tree, what he claims it represents—
3. The root of this tree.
4. The *branches* of it.
5. The wild Olive tree represents whom ?

I think it is his duty to explain what he means by the terms he uses, and whenever he does, I will reply.

ARGUMENT AND EXPLICATION.

I closed my last speech by asking where his church, the first Christian model church, was developed. I could find nothing like it in Eden, nor even in the family of Abel, nor in the Ark, nor yet in the families of Abraham, Isaac or Jacob, nor in Egypt. Where are we to look for it? The Jewish church—the Jewish church is the place, and the thing we hear on every hand.

How much the Elder—how much Pedobaptists for the past 200 years have made of the *Jewish Church*! But, alas ! as it is about sprinkling and the grounds of Infant Baptism, they cannot agree among themselves *when it commenced* ! The majority of writers, and Presbyterians generally, maintain that it was constituted in connection with the Covenant of Grace, that was made with Abraham. ratified by the Seal of Cir-

cumcision. But my learned friend declares, before Abraham's day it was, being 1000 years before Circumcision! Others still contend that it commenced with Moses at Sinai.

As I have abundantly refuted my opponent's theory, and with it his whole argument, I will briefly state and notice these also, since it is this proposition, by whomsoever held, upon whatsoever ground, I wish to disprove.

That this Covenant with Abraham is by the most eminent Pedobaptists believed and held and put forth as their only real ground to justify Infant Baptism, let me read the statements of a few of their brightest lights. Dr. Wardlaw, of England, says :

"We state our argument thus: Before the coming of Christ the Covenant of Grace had been revealed, [i. e., to Abraham]; and in that Covenant there existed a Divinely instituted connection between children and their parents; the sign and seal of the blessings of the Covenant was, by Divine appointment administered to children; and there can be produced no satisfactory evidence of this connection having been done away."—*Inft. Bap.* p. 20.

Here God's Covenant with Abraham and his seed is regarded as "The Covenant of Grace," which is the everlasting Covenant of Redemption.

All Pedobaptists who believe the church was constituted by the covenant made with Abraham agree with Dr. Wardlaw that the Covenant of Circumcision is the everlasting Covenant of Grace. This is their first and fatal error as I will show when I explain the Covenants and the law. This egregious error is the main strength of infant baptism! Upon this bank of fog the entire argument to support it is founded.

The great Dr. Wilson of England, Presbyterian, in his work on Infant Baptism, and the setting up of the church, says :

"It is upon the constitution and membership of that church under the immediate superintendence of the author of this covenant [Abrahamic] that THE ARGUMENT FOR INFANT BAPTISM IS ENTIRELY FOUNDED."

The great Dr. Chalmers declared that the main strength of Infant Baptism lies in the Covenant of Circumcision.

Prof. A. A. Hodge of Princeton, New Jersey, in his outlines of Theology, says :

"The church is an outward visible society of professors, He establishes them by the covenant he made with Abraham."

With these agree the most eminent Pedobaptist Theologians and Commentators. Let us examine the claim made for his church, and learn who may be members of it, and how initiated.

The covenant of which circumcision afterwards became the visible token, was made with Abraham when he was an idolater, as his fathers were, living beyond the river Euphrates—see Gen. 12th chapter.

If it did constitute his family into a Christian Church, the first and model church, then it was *composed entirely of idolaters*; and as for Abraham's family, there were no infants, not even children in it—

Eld. Ditzler urges that he was here called out from among the wicked and separated unto God, as the church is said to be called out from the world, etc. How could he have been separated from the wicked by this mere change of locality, and when he went forth among a people as idolatrous and more wicked than the family of Terah and the Chaldeans around him? This call was the simple segregation of Abraham's family from his father's family for God's own particular purpose. I will examine this matter further in my next. I want to give him something definite to do, and therefore present my direct refutation.

Refutation.

ARG. V. (1.) Positive ordinances or institutions of Christianity require in all cases, positive commands.

(2.) The baptism of unconscious infants which is a positive ordinance, is nowhere commanded in the word of God.

If Infant Baptism is anywhere expressly commanded in the word, let Mr. Ditzler produce the passage. But he has impliedly confessed, as has the Committee of his church, that there exists no such command, for they steadfastly refused to accept a proposition, affirming that it was commanded. If they knew of such a command would they have refused to

have affirmed it? And Pedobaptists invariably in all discussions refuse to affirm that Infant Baptism was commanded by Christ, or that the Bible contains a solitary precept for it.

(3.) Therefore Infant Baptism is not an institution of Christianity. But I will buttress this by another.

ARG. VI. (1). That rite or ordinance is evidently not an institution of Christianity but a human tradition of which confessedly by all, no clear example can be found in the word of God.

(2). But there can be no clear example of Infant Baptism found in the word of God.

The proof of this is, 1. From the first introduction of the practice into the *world* (it never was practiced by a Church of Christ) in the fourth or fifth century until now, its supporters have been challenged to produce an example and they have frankly confessed that they could not, because it was not in the Word.

(3). Ergo, Infant Baptism is evidently not an institution of Christianity but a *human tradition*.

Couple these two arguments into one.

ARG. VII. (1). That ordinance which no express command for, or undoubted example of, can be found in the New Testament or Bible, is evidently not of God but a human tradition.

(2). But there can be neither an express command for, nor an undoubted example of, Infant Baptism, found in the word of God, and of course not in the New Testament.

(3). *Ergo*—Infant Baptism is not of God, but a human tradition.

The practice, therefore, hangs upon the second of these two propositions, and I support it with this argument.

ARG. VIII. (1). If there was one precept for, or example of, Infant Baptism in the Bible, the supporters of the practice could and would have found it in the course of 1400 years, and the most distinguished scholars and advocates would not frankly admit there was neither.

(2). But they have not found the precept or the example, and their standard scholars and advocates, frankly admit that neither the one nor the other can be found in the Word. of God.

Ergo—(3). The word does not contain either precept for, or example of, Infant Baptism,

Let me here submit sufficient proofs to sustain my minor.

LUTHER.—“It cannot be proved by the sacred Scripture that infant baptism was instituted by Christ.”—In A. R.’s *Vanity of Inf. Bap.*, part ii, p.8.

ERASMUS. "Paul does not seem in Rom. vi, 4 to treat about infants.

It was not yet the custom for infants to be baptized."—*Anno.* on Rom. v, 14.

CALVIN.—"Because Christ requires teaching before baptizing, and will have believers only admitted to baptism, baptism does not seem to be rightly administered, except faith precede."—In Wallace on *Chr. Bap.* p. 52.

LIMBORCH.—"There is no express command for it in Scripture; nay, all those passages wherein baptism is commanded, do immediately relate to adult persons, since they are ordered to be instructed, and faith is prerequisite as a necessary qualification. There is no instance that can be produced, from whence it may indisputably be inferred, that any child was baptized by the Apostles."—*Com. Sys. of Div.*, b. v, c. xxii, § 2.

Bp. BURNET.—"There is no express precept, or rule, given in the New Testament for the Baptism of infants."—*Expo. of 39 Art.* Art. xxvii.

DR. M. STUART.—"Commands, or plain and certain examples, in the New Testament relative to it, I do not find."—On *Baptism*, p. 201.

R. MONTGOMERY.—"Scripture makes no direct and authoritative reference to infant baptism at all. It cannot be shown that Scripture gives any open, plain, and decisive precept to baptize infants" (*The Gospel, in Advance*, &c., p. 402.)

ARG. IX. (1). If none are to be baptized by the authority of the Great Commission, Matt. 28, which is the only law of baptism, but such as are made disciples by being taught,

(2). Then, as unconscious infants are incapable of being taught,

(3). They ought not to be baptized.

That none are authorized to be baptized by the authority of the Great Commission, but such, etc., is proved by both the command itself and every example recorded in the New Testament.

It is also supported by the most eminent Pedobaptist commentators themselves:

DODDRIDGE.—"I think that illumination, as well as regeneration, in the most important and Scriptural sense of the words, regularly, precedes the administration of the ordinance of baptism."—[*Time out*.

DR. DITZLER'S THIRD SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—As I have in, all the argument I want now or need, till I take up another point, (and I need *no* more at all—my proposition is put beyond all hope of successful attack and Dr. Graves realizes *that* fully) there is only one thing we have to do—hurl back the attacks of the opposition. *We have and hold possession of the field.* All we need to do is, hold on to the fort. He wished to confine it to the New Testament. O, yes; but—*how much of the New Testament did HE quote in his first hour's speech on Mode? Not one letter—not one sentence in a whole hour's speech!!* Think of the change that has so *very suddenly* come over the spirit of his dreams! *How can the economies—the principles of divine government be understood without studying God's laws, his established processes of government?* What Supreme Judge would even *attempt* a decision where most ordinary rights are involved without going into the constitution and fundamental laws that had given rise to *all* subsequent institutions, laws and Government? When especially *all* the law terms were in long use—all the phraseology, and *still the same people* are the *only subjects* as yet, and *the same law-giver* speaking? Is it not wonderfully strange that man *can* be so blinded by prejudices as not to see such plain principles and facts? Does not Paul tell us, 2 Tim. iii, 15–17 that *all* Scripture is given by inspiration, yea, and “*is profitable for doctrine, for instruction in righteousness, etc.*” What Scripture was this that Timothy had learned when (*brephae*) a babe, a child? Not a word of the *New Testament* then existed. It was the *Old*. Yet the last letter Paul ever wrote tells us *it is profitable* for doctrine and instruction, etc. So, “the Bereans are commended by the Apostles for searching and seeing whether what *the Apostles* preached was so or not. Not a word of the *New Testament* did they have. But *Apostolic practice tallied exactly with the Scriptures* which *daily* they searched. Thus all legal rights, all common sense, and all Scripture teaching tell

us to do as we have done—*harmonize* the action of deity and study his government and word to know the truth. On *all else*—atonement, pardon, (justification) redemption, divinity of Christ—*all* go to the Old Testament, but on *Infant Baptism*—on *just this one* question, *cut up* the Bible and let us begin in the middle of things—not as in all else—at the beginning! He says “the church was founded on circumcision.” We will simply say *it is not so*—he gave not a word of proof—and I defer my examination of that to my *next* speech.

He reads from certain works and asserts that we baptize infants *as a means of grace to them* ! He knows we never did so. He knows he puts on those words an interpretation they are not intended by us to have.

By “means of grace” both Baptists and Pedobaptists in all such cases mean, aids, helps in duty, that in all cases where we pray, take the Lord’s supper, be baptized, contemplating adults in all these cases and *only* them, as he well knows, the parties so “using the means of grace” are aided, strengthened and established in the faith, and enjoy the pleasant consciousness of doing their duty, while God works within. These writers are not presuming that enemies are lurking in the bushes always ready to torture their honest words, garble their sentences, and mar their meanings.

He says the sign represents *a lie* in the infant; if baptism is a sign, there is nothing in the infant it can represent.

1. We know circumcision was a sign of the circumcision of the heart. Gen. xvii, 11, with Rom. iv; 11, 28, 29; Col. ii, 11. Yet *it* was administered to infants at eight days old. We have *God’s* word for *all of that*.

2. Circumcision was constantly appealed to—used as symbolic of loving God with a pure heart. Deut. x, 16; Jer. ix, 26; iv, 45; Lev. xxvi, 41; Ezek. xlv, 8–10; Acts vii, 51; Phil. iii, 3; Jer. ix, 25, 26. Hence to “circumcise your hearts to love the Lord thy God” was a favorite expression. Yet it was administered at eight days old.

3. We assert it *does properly* represent what the *infant has*. Primarily water represents “*innocence*” the world over, and in the Bible. David—“I will wash my hands in innocence.”

Pilate washed his hands—I am free from the blood—innocent of the blood of Christ. This use will not be questioned, we presume. Now though inheriting a depraved nature, no infant is *guilty* before God or man. He is not a *sinner*. He is innocent. Now *we* as transgressors, sinners, have to have the Spirit to *regenerate* us to make us as innocent as the babe and fit for heaven. Hence the water symbolizes to us, then, most properly the pouring of the Spirit upon us by which, through regeneration, we are made innocent before God—the merit of the blood is applied, and all guilt taken away. As the child grows to maturity his baptism, yea, whenever he sees water used, or falling from heaven, or drinks the pure and refreshing element, ought to be reminded of the water of life—the Spirit of grace and supplication. Thus it is to him (*sperotama*) the *pledge*, the answer, “*the stipulation*,” as Peter calls it—1. Peter, i, 23—of a good conscience. So this objection fails in three ways, is *triply* answered, overthrown.

Baptism, he says—“Christian baptism constitutes *the essential differentia*.” We will see that in our next speech and *down* it *will go*.

He says the *national* Israel was a *type* of the church—only a type of the spiritual Israel.” Well, now :

1. What part was *type*? They had baptism—of *what* was it a type? They had circumcision—*itself* a sign, a token, a seal. Of *what* was it a type in the New Testament church? By the gentleman’s position, these things *were all types of types—these last* were types of something in the New Testament church!!

Now 2. There must be a just correspondence between shadow and substance—between type and anti-type. They must correspond to a *nicety* in *all essential* points. One may fall far below the other in power, force, extent. A Sabbath-day may represent *eternal* rest. A bit of bread or wine represent the body and blood of Jesus. But there is a *truth* as the basis of the *typical* use of the one and the other. If, then, the Jewish Israel did not even require purity—require and provide for a pure or spiritual membership, it is a *miserable* type of the church. You fail again. Moreover—no proof at all was offered that it was the type. We deny it utterly.

He asks us—what was the “remnant?” We demonstrated what it was. Paul told us most emphatically. He asks: Was the olive tree Abraham or Christ? Paul tells us it was “the remnant.” That all unbelieving Jews “fell,” “stumbled,” “were rejected,” “were broken off,” “were cast away,” “were cast out,” as children of the bondwoman, clinging to the law of commandments contained in ordinances. Gal. iv. 30; Rom. xi. 15, 16, 17, 19, 20; Eph. ii 16. Now, out of what were unbelievers cast—from what were they broken off by rejecting Christ? Whatever it was—all who believe—all who accept Christ are grafted into the olive from which these were ejected. But are we not incorporated into his church in this process? Of course we are. That tells most plainly what it means.

But he asks is it Christ or Abraham? What does he mean by that? Simply smoke. Suppose it mean Christ? Is he not the head of the church? Col. i. 18, 24; Eph. i. 21, 22; ch. iv. 13–16. If we be in him as the vine—baptized into the one body, “which is Christ”—1. Cor., xii. 12, 13, are we not in his church? If we are spiritually Abraham’s seed, is it not the same? You can clearly see the whole aim of my worthy opponent here is dust—smoke.

Alas! now, the Doctor goes into “syllogisms” heavily. And what silly ones they are—me! Take the one I first caught. There must be a positive command to you else you are not under obligation to obey. No such positive command exists as to infants. Therefore, it is wrong—does not follow. As Burns says:

“Ah, do I live to see it?”

Now 1. There is no positive command in the Bible to any of us—to any of you—to be baptized! The sole—the only command we have is given to the administrator of baptism—not to any subject at all. And our reception of it is purely an inference of duty. As the apostles are commanded to “go, disciple all the nations, *baptizing* them,” we (1) infer it is perpetual—to descend through all ages, as he promised so to be with them always.

2. We infer *our* duty to submit to baptism from the fact

of *the Apostles* being so commanded. Thus we see *how rash* is his position and how defective his so-called syllogism.

He says "No baptism—no church!" But the Jews baptized—were all baptized. We will notice that in our *next* speech in full.

But he states that the kingdom of God is *the church*. It takes every visible church on earth to make up the kingdom of God." *That* is the best truth the Doctor has uttered during this debate. Keep on there and you are bound to get all right. Now this kingdom is spoken of in David's day often, Ps. cxlv. 11, 12; xi. 7, 8, in Daniel vi. and often. It was familiar to the Jews when Christ came—in every mouth. You will not deny this. See Acts i. 6; Luke xi. 16; Matt. vi. 3, 10, etc. Again, Matt. xxi. 43, "Therefore I say unto you, [Jews] *the kingdom* [you say *church*] *shall be taken from you and given [leased out,]* it reads in the Greek—*let out*] to a nation [Gentiles] bringing forth the fruits thereof." Here Christ tells the Jews plainly the kingdom they had always had—compared to having the use of a vineyard—so the ancient Prophet said of it also—should be taken from them. This shows former *possession*—*possession* implied *existence* of course.

Nay, *the same* was to be given to the Gentiles. So we saw from Gal. v. 30; Rom. xi. etc. The Doctor says this kingdom was *the church*. All Baptists and "Disciples" have so taught. So this shows the *true spiritual* church had existed—was *not* destroyed—was let out to Gentiles and *all* on a *common level*.

He says I said there was *no carnal* ordinance in the times before Abraham. I never talk so carelessly. If the Doctor will watch he will find that I am very careful always as to what I say. All I said is true, viz: that *there was no record of any* command for an ordinance or ritualistic ceremony till circumcision. Of course we all know of Noah's altar, Abel's sacrifice and Cain's offering. What has *that* to do with a *recorded command for a regular ordinance*? There is no recorded command about *any* of these cases. Nor do they rank as regular ritualistic ordinances to be performed like circumcision, baptism, etc.

But *worse* and *more* of it! Because Paul looks on *the whole church as a unit*—as a whole—one, just as Rom. v. and I Cor. xv. 18–25, etc., he treats *the whole human race as a unity* from a certain stand-point, and catalogues the representatives of the various ages of the church by such men as Abel, Enoch, Elijah, Abraham, Moses, etc. Dr. Graves lets himself down to the LITTLE twaddle of a “Disciple” preacher we heard use that ridiculous conceit and tells us Cain *killed Abel*, therefore he killed the church!! Has Dr. G. so abandoned *all* hope—has he so despaired of rallying that he can *thus* come down? Surely it is humiliating. Here Dr. G. 1, Makes the church consist ALONE in *the persons* of its *individuals*, and then in *visible, organized form*. By this rule, were all Christians disbanded—scattered abroad—there would exist no church of God because *no organized form* of it is seen, and it cannot be reinstated again.

2. It assumes that *Abel* was the *only* good man or being then living, whereas Paul only gives *one* in most of the ages he represents. This is *ad captandum* of the most astonishing character.

3. He utterly ignores the point we made, viz: that the church is *one, covering all ages, all climes, all dispensations*. Hence the death of this or that member affects not its existence. It exists in *Heaven and earth*, in *all* ages, composed of *all God's people*, as we showed. Heb. xii, 24; Eph. iii, 13, 14. Hence, if *all the members on earth were to perish*, the church of God *lives on* in its membership on high—its Head—Jesus Christ, and its saving principles. The moment any number of beings embraced Christ, the Head, received the Spirit, *they are a part of the one church*.

This is the *Bible* view, but not *Dr. Graves'* He denies that the covenant was made with Abraham. God *said* it was between Him and Abraham. Gen. xvii, 2: “I will make my covenant between *me and thee*.” “Behold my covenant is with thee,” v, 4. “I will establish my covenant between me and thee,” v, 7.

But, suppose it were not so, what has that to do here? It is one of the Doctor's wild theories that he runs in on prac-

tical questions, that have no place here. The point is, *the church developed out of God's covenant of redemption*, any number or numbers of the people saved by the provisions of that covenant could worship together, and *they* would constitute a *visible* church, a local congregation, forming a *part* of God's spiritual family—spiritual church. All spirituality comes through God's covenant of redemption—all salvation. Hence we say the church developed out of it, first the spiritual family, which is essentially *and forever* one. In any age or country any number of these co-operating together form a local church, a visible body. That is what we mean by *visible* church. As Dr. Graves occupies *both* positions on the visible—invisible question, I know not just where he stands to-day. He is on both sides really. I hope he will settle yet.

The Doctor spent fifteen minutes of his hour's speech on the former proposition, exhibiting great soreness on it. He has been worrying himself over *Mary's feet* being baptized. It was *Christ's* feet baptized by Mary, Doctor. The Doctor is so confused that he hardly knows Mary from Christ, he is very wild. Ewing would be good company just now—boon companions.

Alas! he got off on logic again. And *such* logic! *There was not a strictly logical proposition in anything he said*, not a single correct syllogism. Hence it deserves no attention. What logic is there in such stuff as this? Such and such commentators, A., B., C., & D., say there is no express command, or no authority to baptize infants. Pedobaptists do baptize them, therefore it is wrong!! And do you call this logic! Then let me follow suit. A., B., C., & D., say that the Baptist church *is no church*. Being no church it is wrong to baptize, etc, therefore, they do wrong, etc., etc.

Take Mill, Whateley, Aristotle, etc., and run their text-books on logic through a threshing machine, and the scraps would be as good logic quite, as all that.

The Doctor rails out that all the Jews, the whole band of them, come into the church under my principles. That all depends on whether they repent, believe, and thus receive Christ. They must be "*Jews inwardly*." "*They must eat spiritual meat, and drink spiritual drink*." "*They must drink*

of the spiritual rock, Christ." 1 Cor. x, 2, 3, "They must esteem the reproach of Christ great riches," as did the old Jew, Moses, Heb. xi, 24, 26. All others are "rejected." So we *elaborately* and *clearly* explained.

The Doctor confounds as his brethren always do, *covenant* and *church*. A covenant is *one* thing, a compact, agreement, or stipulation; a *church* is another, being composed of people.

He tells us circumcision was done away. It is yet to be observed in some great millennial vision of his. Well, well. That will do. Peter thought it was a burden neither they nor their fathers could bear. So did Paul. He indeed thought if ye be circumcised you became debtor to the whole law, and Christ became of no effect, Gal. v, 2, 3, 4. It seems they were as blind as we Pedobaptists, however. It is even to be one of the glories of the millennium!! Well, all right; it don't hurt my position any only it looks a little funny.

Dr. Graves is hard to accommodate. He is now astonished I should get through so soon. But he was astonished Saturday that I "tarried so long." He thought fifteen minutes were enough then, now, *two days* are short enough. Verily he can't be accommodated. Now who but myself ever took a whole hour and a half on *one single phase* of this subject?

He would have you believe I run through in hot haste as if tired of the subject, when he knows I dwelt *five times* as long on the oneness of the church as any man in debate in the whole history of debates *ever* did, save myself. I know that *this* is our *strong* position—that they can never touch it and *three-fourths* of all we will have to say will still be in defense of this position. Some contend over little outside issues—some on the number of covenants made—confuse the people endlessly. A world of dust can be blown up there, and hence the usual flourish of the covenants. We plant ourselves on THE ONENESS OF THE COVENANT OF REDEMPTION—NO ONE SAVED EXCEPT THROUGH IT—and consequently, THE ONENESS OF THE CHURCH WHOSE HEAD *was and is Jesus Christ*—whose salvation was through the covenant of redemption, not the covenant at Sinai for a moment.

Once more and *constantly* we call your attention to our points.

1. We have met every point he has made, save we deferred two or three till next speech—points easily met. We have rolled back every objection he brought.

2. He has not met a single point we made—no, not a point.

1st. We showed there was a church long before Christ came in the flesh.

2nd. That it was spiritual—1st. in its doctrines and principles. 2d. in its symbolic ordinances—circumcision and baptism.

3d. That Infants were in it—this Carson, Gale, A. Campbell all admit.

4. That Infants received its symbolic ordinances—circumcision and baptism.

They demand *chapter and verse for all*. We gave it. Now *we* demand the same. Let him show clearly, unmistakably—

1. Where the old church was done away.

2. Reconcile this with God's government.

3. Reconcile it with the prophecies of perpetuity everywhere given to that church, quoted by us in our two opening speeches; he has not dared attempt it.

4. Let him show when and where the *new* church was organized; then,

5. Let him reconcile that with all the texts we quoted against its possibility, such as Matt. xxi. 43,

6. Let him show that it is on such radically different principles that the infants are all legislated out, that God discovered his wisdom was at fault, his economy wrong, and he improved it.—*Time out.*]

DR. GRAVES' THIRD REPLY

Replication.

MR. PRESIDENT:—It is incumbent on me to follow wherever my opponent sees fit to lead. But I am compelled to put my protest on record. He persistently refuses to define his terms. He has not defined what he understands to be a visible church, nor will he endorse the definition contained in the article of his Discipline. He continues to confound what theologians call the invisible church, in which there never was, or can be a living infant, or unregenerate person, with the visible body that possesses an organization, laws and ordinances. I will now ask him, in your hearing, can there be a visible church of Christ without a definite organization, laws and ordinances? I know not what he will answer; he may say that these do not constitute a church, but the point is, can there be a Christian church without them? Never heard of any sane man who would claim that there ever was, or can be. His Discipline says there *must be sacraments* duly administered where there is a church. Dr. N. Rice, (Presbyterian) says, without baptism, there can be no church—all standard theologians agree with him. It then follows, conclusively, that there was no Christian *church* in the Old Testament Dispensation.

He quotes Hebrews xii. 1, 2, in proof that those witnesses referred to, constituted a visible church. Paul referred to those worthies, naming one or two in each age, as witnesses of the faithfulness of God.

He answers that, "the good olive tree is the church—the remnant preserved." This is too indefinite for an answer. Will he answer this: Is the olive tree the *visible* Christian church, which Christ set up, and into which all Gentiles could be grafted by faith, or merely the invisible church, "the whole number of the saved among the Jews, in all ages?" I want an answer, and then will attend to this, and show you how

fatal to infant membership this passage is, for, if he says it was the church before Christ, in the wilderness, none could be members except they had *faith*. Those without it were broken off—those who stood in it, stood by faith, and all those who were introduced were grafted in by faith—whatever body this was—it was indeed a body of faithful men—no infants in it.

To prove the identity of the Christian with the Jewish nation, he strangely enough introduces the allegory of Sarah and Hagar, Gal. iv. 31, the very strongest and clearest Scripture, taken in connection with Hebrews xii. 18–29, that can be produced, or that need be to prove the contrary. Elder Ditzler denies that the Jewish Commonwealth, or the literal Kingdom of Israel is typical of anything, much less of the Kingdom of Christ. Paul teaches differently.

Hagar personating the Sinaitic Covenant, represented the literal and fleshly descendants of Abraham, as incorporated by that covenant into the Jewish nation—temporal Israel, a body of men naturally born, as Ishmael was, of whom the Jerusalem below was their capital city in which they were all registered. Sarah was a figure of the Gospel church under the administration of the new covenant; and Isaac, a son of promise supernaturally born, was a figure of those who composed this church each one born from above—supernaturally born. I present the teachings of Adam Clarke upon this subject, the acknowledged exponent of all true Methodists.

“For these are the two covenants] These signify two different systems of religion; the one by Moses, the other by the Messiah.

“The one from the mount Sinai] On which the law was published; which was typified by Hagar, Abraham’s bondmaid.

“Which gendereth to bondage] For, as the bondmaid, or slave, could only gender, bring forth her children in a state of slavery; and subject also to become slaves: so all that are born and live under those Mosaic institutions, are born and live in a state of bondage; a bondage to various rites and ceremonies; under the obligation to keep the whole law; yet, from its severity, and their frailness, obliged to live in the habitual breach of it; and, in consequence, exposed to the curse which it pronounces.

*“Answereth to Jerusalem] Hagar the bondmaid, bringing forth children in a state of slavery, answereth to Jerusalem, that now is, *nustoiçhei*, points out or bears a similitude to Jerusalem in her present state of subjection; which, with her children, her citizens are not only in bondage to the Romans, but in a*

worse bondage to the *law*, to its oppressive *ordinances*, and to the heavy curse which it has pronounced against all those who do not keep them "

"[*Is free, which is the mother of us all.*] There is a spiritual Jerusalem, of which this is the type; and this Jerusalem, in which the souls of all the righteous are, is free from all bondage and sin; or by this, probably the kingdom of the Messiah was intended; and this certainly answers best to the apostle's meaning, as the subsequent verse shows There is an *earthly Jerusalem*, but this *earthly Jerusalem typifies a heavenly Jerusalem*: the former with all her *citizens*, is in *bondage*; the latter is a *free city*, and all her *inhabitants* are also and this Jerusalem is *our mother*; it signifies the church of Christ, the *metropolis of Christianity*, or rather the *state of liberty* into which all true believers are brought."

Now Ishmael represents in this allegory, all merely naturally born persons, the *infants of all*, they are *carnal*, generated children of wrath, until re-generated by the Holy Spirit, and what saith the Scriptures. Cast out the bondwoman and her son, cast out of the Gospel church what they represent—purge away all *Judaism* and its fleshly claims and laws—reject all merely naturally-born infants, for these by reason of their first birth cannot and shall not heir with the son of the free woman or the regenerate, the children of God by faith in Christ.

He has asked for an express law to put infants out. Here is a positive command not to admit the infant of any one, Jew or Gentile, saint or sinner, into the church of the New Testament. CAST THEM ALL OUT, is the language of the Holy Ghost which all men will do well to heed, natural infants shall not enjoy church privileges with the children of God.

All can see that the Apostle Paul knew and acknowledged no organization, no body of men under the Jewish Dispensation of the Covenant that God made with Abraham, that was identical with the church of the Gospel Dispensation, and we should recognize none—to do so is to Judaize Christianity.

HEBREWS XII.

I will, in connection with this, explain Hebrews xii, which my opponent most strangely perverted, claiming that it referred to the "Church invisible," "the whole number of the saved in all ages." Instead of referring to such a body or to the Saints under the Jewish Dispensation or any number of them, the passage expressly refers to the Gospel Church as the anti-

type of the Jews as a Nation, and while under the Sinaitic Covenant—the Law. I know of no Scripture that is more generally or more grossly mistaught than this, unless it is **Matt. xi. 12.** In giving the true explication of this one passage, it will be a perfect refutation of all he has advanced to support his cause. I will give a running exegesis of the entire passage.

Verse 18. *For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched*, etc.; to a palpable, material mountain, like Mt. Sinai—to which the literal Jews were once brought.

Verse 22. *But ye are come unto Zion—even unto the city of the living God—the heavenly Jerusalem.* The Gospel Church is represented constantly under the figure of a City—the city of the living God—the city that hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God—the Church in her glorified state—when she has become the Lamb's wife is represented by the symbol of a City. “And he showed me that *great City*, the holy Jerusalem descending out of Heaven from God,” Rev. xxi. 10.

“*And to an innumerable company of angels*---as compared to those by whom the law was given---for all the angels of God are called to be ministering spirits, to minister unto the heirs of Salvation, and the number saved is to be more than any man can number--innumerable.

Verse 23. *To the general assembly, and church of the first born.* A. Clarke says that some of the best MSS. connect general assembly to angels and several of the fathers quote it thus, “to the general assembly of innumerable angels,” and approves the rendering.

“*Of the first born, protokoon*, literally of first born ones.” Israel, as a nation, was God's first born. But each member of the church, under the Gospel dispensation, being born from above and adopted as his child, is joint heir with God's first born, and only son. A Scriptural church is composed of *first born ones*, and the name of every true member is registered in heaven—inscribed in the Lamb's Book of Life—while the members of the Jewish nation were registered only in Jerusalem.

“*To God, the Judge of all*” the church of first born ones is a company of *pardoned* sinners, and if truly pardoned, they

have been tried and adjudged 'worthy of death by the legal judge, and by him alone pardoned and set free. God hath appointed Christ alone, to be judge, and all must come before Him, as a judge, to be tried; either graciously pardoned, or condemned to eternal death. Every Christian, therefore, has once come unto, been tried, and pardoned by the judge of the quick and the dead. And no future judgment awaits such.

"And to the Spirits of just men made perfect"—those sacrifices under the law and blood of bulls and goats could make no one *perfect*, but the sacrifice and blood of Christ, which every member of a Gospel church comes to, can; and therefore such a church may well be called a company of justified men, made perfect by the offering of Jesus Christ.

Verse 22. *"And to Jesus, the Mediator of the New covenant."* Moses was the mediator of the old covenant, a figure, shadow of the real and the effectual Mediator of the new covenant. Every member of the church of first born ones is supposed to have come to God—not through a mere man, but through Jesus.

"And to the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better things than that of Abel" The Jews under the law came to the sprinkling of the blood of sin offerings, that did not avail to cleanse the conscience from its sense of guilt, or the heart from its defilements; but the blood of the everlasting covenant even of Jesus, cleanseth from all sin and never loses its efficacy, forever putting away the remembrance of sins—and so infinitely better than the blood that Abel offered.

Verse 27. *And this word—yet once more signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain."* The whole Jewish polity with the ceremonial law were the things *made* and temporary, which were shaken and soon to be removed, to give place to things that cannot be shaken and are never to be removed—the visible church and kingdom that are never to be broken in pieces or given to another people, but to stand forever. Therefore the Apostle could well have said as he does in verse

28. *"Wherefore we, receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, etc.* Now mark, this was not a "Kingdom in the skies" or

future to them, but present and one they were then in possession of, and so agrees with the expressions throughout this passage—they had already come unto Mt. Zion, and to the general assembly and church of first born ones. If this was the Church triumphant, he would not have said they had come to it.

Every one can see therefore that this church spoken of here was something then present and on this earth, the antithesis and antitype of the Jewish Commonwealth. So the latest critics, as Dean Alford decide.

So important and conclusive is this passage, that I give with the utmost pleasure the comments of Adam Clarke, at length on verses 22, 23 and 24--and most respectfully press them upon the attention of my opponent, for cruder views than his upon all the passages I have noticed, I have never met with, and Methodists should hear their greatest scholar and commentator.

“On the whole, I think the description in these verses, refers to the state of the church *here below*, and not to any *heavenly state*. Let us review the particulars—

1. As the law was given at Mount *Sinai*; so the Gospel was given at Mount *Sion*.

2. As *Jerusalem* was the city of the Living God, while the Jewish dispensation lasted; for *there* was the temple, its services, sacrifices, &c. the Christian Church is now called the *heavenly Jerusalem*, the city of the Living God. In it is the great Sacrifice; in it that spiritual worship which God, the infinite Spirit, requires.

3. The ministry of angels was used under the *Old Covenant*; but that was *partial*, being granted only to particular persons, such as Moses, Joshua, Manoah, &c.; and only to a few before the law, as Abraham, Jacob, &c. It is employed under the *New Covenant*, in its utmost latitude; not to a few peculiarly favored people, but to all the followers of God in general: so that, in this very epistle, the apostle asserts that they are all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister to them that shall be heirs of salvation.

4. At the giving of the law, when the church of the Old Covenant was formed, there was a *general assembly* of the *different tribes* by their representatives: in the Gospel church, all who believe in Christ, of every nation, and kindred, and tongue, form one grand aggregate body. Believers of all nations, of all languages, of all climates, however differing in their color, or local habits, are one in Christ Jesus; one body of which He is the Head. and the Holy Spirit the Soul.

5. The *first-born* under the old dispensation had exclusive privileges; they had authority, emolument, and honor, of which the other children in the same family did not partake; but, under the new, all who believe in

Christ Jesus, with a heart unto righteousness, are equally children of God, are all entitled to the same privileges, for, says the apostle, ye are all children of God by faith in Christ; and to them that receive Him, He gave authority to become the children of God; so that, through the whole of this Divine family, all have *equal rights* and *equal privileges*; all have God for their portion and heaven for their inheritance.

6. As those who had the rights of citizens were *enrolled*, and their names *entered on tables*, &c., so that it might be known who were *citizens* and who had the rights of such; so, all the faithful under the New Covenant are represented as having their names written in heaven, which is another form of speech for *have a right to that glorious state*, and all the blessings it possesses; *there*, are their possessions, and there are their rights.

7. Only the high-priest, and he but one day in the year, was permitted to *approach God*, under the Old Testament dispensation: but, under the New, every believer in Jesus can *come even to the throne*; each has liberty to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus; and to real Christians alone it can be said, *Ye are come—to God the judge of all*; to Him ye have constant access, and from Him ye are continually receiving grace upon grace.

8. We have already seen that the *righteous perfect*, or the *just men made perfect*, is a Jewish phrase, and signified those who had made the furthest advances in moral rectitude. The apostle uses it here to point out those in the church of Christ who had received the highest degrees of grace, possessed most of the mind of Christ, and were doing and suffering most for the glory of God; those who were most deeply acquainted with the things of God, and the mysteries of the Gospel, such as the apostles, evangelists, the primitive teachers, and those who presided in and over different churches. And these are termed the spirits, *dikaioon tetelei omenoon* of the just perfected, because they were a *spiritual people*; forsaking earth, and living in reference to that *spiritual rest* that was typified by Canaan. In short all genuine Christians had communion with each other, through God's Spirit, and even with those whose faces they had not seen in the flesh.

9. Moses, as the servant of God, and *Mediator of the Old Covenant*, was of great consequence in the Levitical economy. By his laws and maxims every thing was directed and tried; and *to him* the whole Hebrew people *came* for both their civil and religious ordinances; but Christians *come* to Jesus, the Mediator of the New Covenant: He not only stands immediately between God and man, but reconciles and connects both. From Him we receive the Divine law, by His maxims our conversation is to be ruled, and He gives both the light and life by which we walk; these things Moses could not do; and for such spirituality and excellence, the Old Covenant made no provision; it was, therefore, a high privilege to be able to say, *Ye are come to Jesus, the Mediator of the New Covenant*.

10. The Jews had their blood of sprinkling; but it could not satisfy, as touching things which concerned the conscience: it took away no guilt, it made no reconciliation to God; but the blood of sprinkling under the Christian covenant purifies from all unrighteousness; for the blood of the

New Covenant was shed for the remission of sins, and by its infinite merit, it still continues to sprinkle and cleanse the unholy. All these are privileges of infinite consequence to the salvation of man ; privileges, which should be highly esteemed and most cautiously guarded ; and because they are so great, so necessary, and so unattainable in the Levitical economy, therefore we should lay aside every weight, &c., and run with perseverance the race that is set before us. I see nothing, therefore, in these verses which determines their sense to the heavenly state : all is suited to the state of the church of Christ, militant, here on earth : and some of these particulars cannot be applied to the church triumphant on any rule of construction whatever.

I will now resume my search for his church in the family of Abraham.

So far as the record informs us, Abraham the head of this church was at this time an unbeliever and an unjustified man for years after—see Gen. xv. 6.

But it does not relieve the matter to claim that the church was constituted when circumcision was instituted twenty-five years after. I think it would hardly come up to the imperfect definition given in my friend's law book—"a body of *faithful* men"—nor would the only condition of membership have been answered—"a desire to flee the wrath' to come," for only *one* of all the number would have met Eld. Ditzler's invariable condition—*i. e.*, "justified by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, without which, no one ever rightly was, or ever can be a member of the church of Christ." Then, Abraham and his son Ishmael, now thirteen years old, a wild, unregenerate boy, and all Abraham's servants, an army of idolaters, of all ages, from the infant to the old man, either born in his house, or bought with his money. This is his model, Christian church! one Christian to a thousand sinners? But what were the conditions of membership in this church? Not repentance, not faith in God—not regeneration of heart, or reformation of life, but it was the faith of one man, a father or master, alone. Suppose we grant it was a Christian church, and all Abraham's family, wife, sons, and relations, and idolatrous servants, were entitled to membership, because he was, what else follows, from this, just as logically as the baptism of an infant eight days old? Why

1. That all children and slaves whose ancestors, however remote—though a thousand years ago—were Christians, must

be brought in without profession of personal faith or repentance. This was the law of circumcision.

Let me bring this home to each.

A few years ago the institution of slavery was in force with us as it was in the patriarchal age, and there were masters who owned one thousand slaves. Suppose one of these to have professed faith in Christ, and offered himself to one of Elder Ditzler's societies in Mississippi or Louisiana. The Elder, carrying out his theory, would not only receive him to membership, but his godless wife and eight or ten wicked children of all ages, from eight days to forty years, but these one thousand slaves also, untaught, unbelieving, and not a whit better than heathen, who never heard of Christ! What sort of a church would this be? Now each one of the embruted slaves would have as good a right to membership in the church as the infant of eight days old, if baptism comes in the room of circumcision and is governed by the same law.

But this is not all, nor the worst of it.

2. This theory would embrace every godless man and woman and infant and slave in the county, in the State, in the nation—in the world and bring them all into the Church without repentance—because one and all had a believing ancestor—if we have to go back to Noah for him.

Now, following out my illustration. Upon one of the neighboring plantations lives a family of unregenerate children, whose father was a believer, and upon another plantation, another family of godless children, whose grand-parents were believers, and upon still another place a family of non-professors, one of whose remote ancestors, some one hundred years ago, was a believer, and on each of these places were a thousand untaught slaves, from eight days to eighty years old. According to Eld. Ditzler's theory, all these godless mothers and children with their four thousand untaught slaves, must be taken into Eld. Ditzler's church, and the ordinances administered to them. What sort of a church would this be? A church in which the godless wife and children and all slaves of any age, whose masters should profess faith in Christ, must be included and granted all its privileges?

I say this is what this false position demands, and the most eminent advocates of Pedobaptism have frankly avowed it.

The Westminster Assembly's Confession of Faith says :

"The seed and posterity of the faithful born within the Church, have by their birth, interest in the covenant and a right to the seal.

Mr. Rothband says :

"Children may be lawfully accounted within God's Covenant if any of their ancestors, IN ANY GENERATION were faithful."—[In Tombe's Examples p. 32.

Peter Martyr says :

"Infants that are born of believers belong to God before their Baptism. Though they had not a father or mother that was acquainted with God, yet perhaps they had *some ancestors* who were so favored and therefore they are members of the Church.

Now since it is a noteworthy fact that there never yet has been invented a theory by one set of Pedobaptist theologians on which to ground Infant Baptism, that another set, fully as eminent, has not exposed as groundless and absurd, so with this. Thos. Boston, a renowned Presbyterian theologian, author of Fourfold State, thus upsets my opponent's theory of getting all children into the Church under the Old Testament economy. Will all Presbyterians hear their witness testify?

Thos. Boston says :

"If infants may derive their rights before the church, or the evidence of this right before the Lord, to baptism from their remote parents, then either from any of them whatsoever or from some of them only, I know no midst. If from any of them whatsoever, then there is no infant under heaven that hath not a right to baptism ; which is absurd. The reason of the consequence is because there is not an infant in the world that is not come of parents that were godly ; which will hold true so long as it remains undoubted that all the world is come of Noah and of Adam."

But why need I quote more authorities to prove the absurdity of the only argument the standard advocates of Infant Baptism rely on to support it. I fear Eld. Ditzler has not permitted himself to understand the main argument for Infant Baptism. I want to hear him develop his views of the Covenant of Circumcision, and its relation to the church.

That rule in Logic is self-evident to you all, that an argument that proves too much *is manifestly false*.

But there is another singular malady of which this whole theory is fatally sick. NONE BUT MALES WERE EVER, *are now or EVER CAN BE MEMBERS* of the Church of Christ unless he can find some express modification of the law of circumcision in the New Testament. He does or he does not, rely upon the provisions of the covenant of circumcision in order to get the children of all, saints and sinners, into his church. If he does, then I will force him to avow the position that Thos. Boston demonstrates as absurd—a theory that receives all, young and old, masters and slaves, by baptism into the Church *as the statute law of his Church does*, or if he does not rely upon it, he should come boldly forth and repudiate it. And I intend to force him to do the one or the other. We all want to know where Methodists stand on this question, from what source they claim authority for Infant Baptism as they practice it—for it should be known to all that Methodists do not base their practice of it upon the same ground that Presbyterians do.

Now Mr. President the first rule in Hedge's Logic, by which we are governed, requires that every term used by a disputant should be defined. I, therefore, respectfully call upon my opponent, as it is my right, to define the terms he is constantly using.

1. What he means by a Christian church, or Church of God—or if he has not the time, will he state before this audience,

2. If he endorses Art. 25 of his own Discipline as a definition by which he will be understood in this discussion.

3. I call on him to define what he means by the Covenant of Grace—does he mean “The Covenant of Redemption?”

4. Will he tell us *when, where* and with *whom* that Covenant was made?

5. Did or did it not call a Christian Church into existence constituting the one with whom it was made the federal head of it?

6. Will he definitely tell us *when* and *where* the Christian Church, or Church of Christ, was constituted?

7. Will he state distinctly in what relation Abraham stood to the Christian Church—was he the head of it? Was he a member of it?

8. Will he definitely and explicitly state what relation, if any, circumcision has to the rite of Christian baptism, and especially tell us if it comes “in the room of it?”

While he is preparing his answers, I will tell you what some clear-headed Presbyterian theologians say about the relation of circumcision and baptism.

DR. ERSKINE.—“Baptism has none of those properties which rendered circumcision a fit sign and seal of an external covenant. Circumcision impressed an abiding mark; was the characteristic of Judaism; belonged to all Jews, however differing in opinion or practice; and those born of a Jew, even when come to age, were entitled to it; whereas baptism impresses no abiding mark. A profession and suitable practice, not baptism, is the characteristic of Christianity” (*Theol. Diss.*, pp. 78, 79). He also says: “When God promised the land of Canaan to Abraham and his seed, circumcision was instituted, for *this* among other purposes, to shew that descent from Abraham was the foundation of his posterity’s right to those blessings.”—*Theol. Diss.*, p. 9.

DR. W. L. ALEXANDER, on Dr. Wardlaw’s argument that because the infant descendants of Abraham were circumcised, the infant children of believers should be baptized, questions “if any one tried to re-produce the argument in his own mind, without feeling that there were some serious gaps in it, over which one had to take a flying leap in order to reach the conclusion.” “I can understand how a certain class of privileges should run along the line of natural descent, and how another class should run along the line of spiritual descent; but how the two should interlace so as that natural descent should entitle to privileges which belong only to spiritual descent, I find nothing in the reasoning of this book that helps me to comprehend.” This argument from the Abrahamic covenant in favour of infant baptism always presents itself in my mind as fallacious.” Further, “If baptism is to be regarded as having come in the place of circumcision, the argument from the Abrahamic covenant lies altogether with the Baptists.—*Life of Dr. W.*, pp. 237-239.

DR. M. STUART.—“How unwary, too, are many excellent men, in contending for infant baptism on the ground of the Jewish analogy of circumcision! Are females not proper subjects of baptism? And again, Are a man’s slaves to be baptized because he is? Are they church members of course where they are so baptized? Is there no difference between engrafting into a politico-ecclesiastical community, and into one, of which it is said that it is not of this world? In short, numberless difficulties present themselves in our way as soon as we begin to argue in such a manner as this.”—*Old Tes. Can.*

Who before me will say, in view of all these facts, that there is the shadow of authority in the Covenant made with Abraham, for the baptism of an infant, on the ground that the family of Abraham and the Christian Church, under the New Testament, were one and the same bodies, baptism only having superseded the old token of the same covenant? Read the provisions of that covenant. It was an *everlasting* covenant, to be perpetually observed by the *self-same family* to which it was originally given, that of Abraham alone, and for the self-same *purpose*, and to secure the self-same *ends*. *The token is as unalterable and unchangeable as the covenant it ratified.* Now by what authority does Elder Ditzler or any man abolish it, or change and supersede it by baptism? Not from God the author of it. Christ did not change it. The apostles did not. They practiced it. Christian Jews practiced circumcision throughout the apostolic age, but not as a church rite. They may, and I believe *should now*, and until Christ's second coming. It is a mark that designates the *nation*. It never will be discontinued by the Jews until the Advent.

Refutation.

ARG. X. (1). If there be but one way for all, both parents and children, Jews and Gentiles, to be admitted into the Gospel church, and that is upon the *profession* of their personal faith in Christ and baptism, then should neither parent nor child to the end of time be admitted in any other way.

(2) But there is but one way.

If there is a Baptism for infants without faith, and another for adults with faith, then there are two baptisms. 1 Cor. xii, 13. "For in one spirit we are all immersed into one body"—*i. e.*, the visible Church of Christ, (read rest of the chapter). Jno. iii, 15, "Except any one be born of water, and added to the previous birth of the Spirit from above, he cannot enter the Kingdom of God."

(3). Therefore no man, woman or child, was ever naturally born into Christ's Church, which is fatal to the whole theory of Infant Baptism.

ARG. XI. (1) Whatever practice adds the *unsaved* to the Church of Christ, is subversive of it, and is not of God.

(2) Infant Baptism does this; for according to the teachings of the Discipline and the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, all infants are born depraved, the children of wrath, and they continue in this state until regenerated by the Spirit of God. While in this state they are unsaved,

(3) Therefore the practice of Infant Baptism is subversive of the Church of Christ, and is not of God.

ARG. XII. (1). Whatever practice reflects upon the honor, wisdom or faithfulness of Jesus Christ, or renders Him less faithful in his church than Moses was in his house, and makes one of the great ordinances of God's Word to lie more obscure in the New Testament than any law or precept in the Old Testament, *cannot be of God*.

(2) To suppose that Infant Baptism is a Christian duty, is to reflect upon the honor, wisdom, and faithfulness of Jesus Christ; for if it is an ordinance of Christ, and its supporters cannot find it commanded or exemplified, rewarded or punished in God's Word, it certainly makes Christ less faithful than Moses; for Moses left not one of the least of all the ordinances or rites of the law, dark, or in the least difficult to be understood, whether an ordinance or not. But the Holy Spirit expressly declares that Christ was more faithful than Moses.

Ergo. The institution of Infant Baptism (a law or example for which Pedobaptists confess they cannot find, and concerning its use, differ so generally among themselves) is no ordinance of Christ, and per consequence, cannot be of God.

ARG. XIII. (1) Whatever theory opens the door to all the corruptions that characterize the great Apostacy, such as the adulterous union of the church and state, human priests, literal sacrifices, sacraments, etc., is manifestly opposed to the teachings of the Word of God, and subversive of the Church of Christ.

(2) The theory upon which Pedobaptists introduce unregenerate children into the Church of Christ—*i. e.*, the identity of the old Jewish commonwealth with the Christian Church, manifestly does open wide the door to church and state, a human priesthood, etc.,

(3) Therefore the *theory* by which Pedobaptists introduce unregenerate children into the Church of Christ, is opposed to the teachings of the Word of God, and subversive of the Church of Christ.

DR. DITZLER'S FOURTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—You can see that I have felt secure when I have allowed the good Doctor to go on through his hour's speech and half hour, and letting it rest till now. As I have all the matter in evidence I want on the Bible argument as yet, nothing is left to be done but to expose the chaffiness—the utter futility of his objections. We expected more work to do, were prepared for a far sterner duty than now devolves on us. The Doctor gave us fair warning, and we took the hint, and dove-tailed our work beyond the power of attack or disjointure. And now we have heard a *third* speech. Presuming he would do as well as he could, we will show now how feeble is the effort to evade our facts.

He first charges that we did not define the word or idea of *church*. We read our speech because of its many historical points, etc., and read a most elaborate definition, and gave the completest *analysis of the whole church* we ever saw. He denies a plain fact to start with. That is failure.

Next he errs on covenant, if we understood him. If he says the covenant between God and Abraham was not the constitution and foundation of the church we traced, and which Paul names, Heb. ii, 12; xii, 24; Eph. iii, 13, 14, under family, then let him explain what *was* the constitution of it, and *what* the foundation of their faith when seeking a city that had foundations, Heb. x. 38, 39; xi, entire; xii, 1–3, 22–24, *all* one point.

If he asserts that the Jewish Church “was founded on circumcision,” as they teach, let him

1, Prove it by showing such declarations or texts as sustain it.

2. Let him explain how the piety of such men as Abel, Enoch, Elijah, Samuel, Moses, Abraham, Daniel, the Hebrew children, and all God's Saints could be so exalted, yet *no covenant of redemption*, no spirituality be in it?

3. If God did not give them the means of a *spiritual church* for four thousand years, who was to blame? If God could not, He was less than God. The *incapacity of the people* cannot be pleaded, for the world has never seen purer men than those we have just named, and time would fail to tell of all, Heb. xi, 32. If God *would* not, He alone was to blame if they *did* fail of duty and civilization, if *he withheld the means*. How can you meet infidelity with such a plea as to God's legislation?

4. Explain how it was the *church existed long before this covenant of blood* was made at Sinai? They are called a church in the Bible—Old and New Testament, repeatedly, long before that covenant was made, long before the Hebrews reached Sinai.

5. Let him explain how it was that *this very ordinance* that he says was its foundation, in the absence of a word of proof, in the face of positive facts to the contrary, against all reason also--the foundation of the church was purely symbolic of the purity of heart. The day it was ordained, Gen. xvii, 11-14, it is called "a token," Paul calls it, quoting from Genesis xvii, 11, in Rom. iv, 11, "the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of faith." He had just told us, ch. ii, 29, that "circumcision is that of the HEART in the Spirit." Hence the *outward* was "the sign of [this *inward*] circumcision." It was "the putting away the body of the sins of the flesh," "made without hands," Col. ii, 11. This ordinance then was purely symbolic of purity of heart, yet administered to the parties in all cases, save Abraham, Ishmael, and Proselytes, at eight days old. Yet through all subsequent adult life it symbolized purity of heart and separation from sin and sinners.

So baptism is symbolic, no more so than the other, and equally appropriate to infants.

Now if the church was not spiritual, not founded on Christ, why did its ordinance, on which you all assert it was founded, so *pointedly* symbolize purity? separation from sin and sinners? The word *church* means in Hebrew, *called*; in Greek, *called*—in both, called out, called together. That is, separation from sinners. Circumcision, the prominent ordinance means primarily *cut off*, *separated*. Thus it answers to the word *church* exactly.

7. If the church was founded on circumcision, and only males were circumcised, how did *they* get into it?

8. As not a soul was circumcised during the forty years of sojourn in the wilderness, Josh. v, 4-8, and yet they were called "the church," in the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures constantly, and so denominated, Acts vii, 38. How did they all get in? This doubly exposes the mass of absurdities in the gentleman's effort to answer

All I have to do is to meet his objections. My work of adamant stands—can't be shaken.

But he says I said no one was a member of the Jewish church unless regenerated. He then urges that infants were not regenerate, hence not in the Jewish church by my position. No, no; I utter no such absurdities, and as the whole of my two speeches were written out and read, they will show that I was far from that. I said aliens, transgressors had to be converted, men who by wickedness had rebelled and become transgressors, sinners, they had to repent, be regenerated, to get into the church. We maintain that such have to be converted to God, to become as fit for the church as are infants without conversion, "of such is the Kingdom of God." We must be converted to become as little children, Matt. xviii, 1-5; xix, 14. They inherit a depraved nature. So you still have a depraved nature after conversion; but through use of the means of grace you suppress it, put back the active development of sinful manifestations, and grace predominates. So, as they grow up, if they are taught, and believe in Jesus, they are transformed into complete Christians, actively by the power of grace upon their hearts, and are most valuable Christians when so developed.

But the Doctor calls for the *diferentia*, the point of difference between the church in the old and modern time. He insists that baptism is the essential *diferentia*. Now that is strange. We want you to remember—keep it in mind now, that we are discussing a great issue. We laid down the foundation of our faith on this subject. These are the best arguments (?) they can bring against our position.

Now, 1 Cor. x, 1, 2, tells him that they were all baptized.

We put it in proof in our proposition just closed—Mode of Baptism—and so did he, that all Jews were baptized. We have baptism. They baptized far oftener than we. So his *diferentiu* falls to the ground. But it was not Christian baptism. Nor is it so called in the New Testament, that is man's term, not the Spirit's.

But he says, "Where was the Lord's supper in the church, till in the Christian church?" We reply

1. It was ordained Exodus xii, 8-21, and ever perpetuated in the church.

2. Church existence did not necessarily depend on it, but it was a privilege and a duty in common with the other duties in God's church.

3. If you deny it was the Lord's Supper in our sense, though all agree it is our Lord's Supper, now simplified—for some purpose spiritually—yet if you deny all this, it destroys your cause here; for your church teaches that the church existed long before Pentecost, long before the crucifixion in Christ's day, and yet never till after Pentecost, did the church celebrate the supper as we now do. So your acknowledged church had baptism and the supper exactly as the Jews had it. Where now the *diferentia*, or great point of difference? You are crushed by your own objections.

But another point we wish to notice, in this connection. There were as great changes between given periods of Jewish history as any the Doctor has attempted to notice between ancient Jewish Israel and the so called later Dispensation. In patriarchal ages till Abraham there was no circumcision.

In the wilderness, circumcision was suspended forty years—ten years over the period of a generation. Here was a pointed change. From the exit of the church—those who "ate the same spiritual meat, drank of the same spiritual drink," who "drank of that Spiritual Rock that followed them: and THAT ROCK WAS CHRIST," I Cor. x. 2-3—is that true?—answer yourself, Doctor—we say it is—till they arrived at Mt. Sinai, no "law of commandments contained in ordinances," Ephesians ii, 15, 16; Col. ii. 14-17. They were "a shadow of

things to come," pointed out Christ, and "the body (church), is of Christ," v. 17; existed then. It was "added" at Sinai, Gal. iii, 17, 19; until Christ should come, and reformation take place—Heb. ix, 10. No carnal, fleshly law existed here then, yet constantly the word church occurs.

They had *only two* ordinances—just as *we now* have—Paschal feast, i. e. Lord's Supper and baptism. *We* have those two. *They* had no "law of commandments contained in ordinances." A Prophet *emphasises* the fact that in the day Jehovah led them out of Egypt he *spoke not* of those things—uttered nothing about the offerings, circumcision, etc. Now, *all this routine of ceremonies came in*—they were "added *till* the Seed [Christ] should come. " When he came and died, they "fell away"—were the bond-woman—sold those who trusted in them into bondage—so the law of them and the adherents of ritualism were all "cast out," Gal. iv, 30; Rom. xi, 17, 19, 20, 21, and not permitted a place with the son of the free woman, the Covenant of Salvation. We repeat, then, if all these things came into the Church and did not destroy it, or result in 1, destroying the Church; 2, in organizing a new one; 3, with change of membership and real design of God—viz: the salvation of man—how much less will the removing of these rites and the Sinaitic law ordaining them, destroy the Church? They came in—they went out. They were surely a parenthesis—not an essential element of God's government. Circumcision existed before Moses. It served its object of outwardly marking the difference between God's people and heathen—baptism sufficiently symbolized inward purity, and this rite, while it did that, marked a distinction between Jews and Gentiles as such, and hence it was condemned to be taken out of the way, it was a mark of enmity. Hence it had served its day, fell away.

5. In the next place, look at the difference between John's ministry and that of Jesus. One baptizes "with water." The other "baptizes with the Spirit." The one baptizes "into repentance." The other baptizes—thoroughly purging his floor—by its purifying power as fire, he separates the chaff from the wheat—removes sin from the heart. Though one

baptized that Christ might be made manifest to Israel, John i, 31, the other baptized with the Spirit and fire, and the anointing remained in them—"a washing of regeneration."

We see then that these variations, and changes did not result in a new church. Nay,

6. A grander change of outward circumstances takes place, for which the great facts just given took place. The Gentiles are to come in. Law for this was given before Christ ascended, Matt. xxviii, 19, 20. But not till from eight to ten years was it carried out. Baptists hold the church existed long before the crucifixion. Well, here is a new law made of vast proportions brief as are its words. "All Nations!"—how searching! Disciple all nations! What a wonderful revolution that will make in the economy of the Church. It is not carried out till from eight to ten years after Pentecost. It had been matter of prophecy for long, long centuries, as we showed in our first two Addresses. Yet did the great new law, not executed for long years, result in a new church? All say no—it would upset us all then, and destroy all our theories. Yes it would, of course. If, then, all these other changes in mere externals, mere questions of days, rites or ritualistic services, abridgments, enlargements, questions of outward economy, did not create new churches each time, why should this one change do it?

7. How can Baptists get around Paul's arguments, put in a "nutshell," in Romans ii, 28, 29! By your position these outward rites made the Jew—made his Church. Paul says it is false; for he says—"He is NOT a Jew who is one outwardly, neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh, but he is a Jew, who is one INWARDLY; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit or by the spirit." In the very face of apostolic assertion, you teach, you assert, you declare from the house-tops, that it was all outward in the flesh. Hear Carson—and A. Campbell asserts the same—

"The very constitution of the Jewish church recognized the membership of carnal persons. It did not make the distinction between those born of the flesh, and those born of the Spirit. There was no law to exclude the Pharisees or even the Sadducees, from the Jewish church. It was no corruption of the constitution of the church to contain them." p. 233.

We showed where there was provision to exclude them—cut them off—gave cases where it was carried out often—at times when the officers in the church did not execute the laws, God did, and cut them off by thousands, because of unbelief—Heb. iii. 16–17–19; x. 6, and we multiplied Scriptures as to the distinction of Israel after the flesh, now carnal Israel and spiritual Israel—that all are not Israel that are of Israel, Rom. ix. 6, Paul asks “who are Israelites to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory and the covenants, and the giving of the law. and the promises—they are not all Israelites who are of Israel. Neither because they are children of Abraham are they all children. That is [says he] they which are the children of the flesh, those are not the children of God. Dr. Graves and Baptists say that is not so!! They are all flesh. Their law required nothing better. True, Deut. vi. 4, 5 quoted by Christ, Mark xii. 29–33, tells us all that to be a true Jew was to love God with all the heart, with the soul, mind, strength;” still Dr. Graves says, that amounts to nothing—it is all flesh.

David prayed Ps. xli. 1, 10, “wash me thoroughly from mine iniquities, and cleanse me from my sins.” O, that all means nothing—it is all flesh. Isaiah i. 11, 16; iv. 4; xlv. 3; Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 26, etc., etc.—all quoted or referred to by us in our first speech, all tell the same truth, and by the wounds of Christ they were all healed—Is. liii. 1, 10. It is all flesh—no requirement of new birth there—no such thought!! If infidelity wants a better stand-point than that, where can it be found?

O, but bad men were in the church then. Yes, in its organized form—in its congregation and partook its ordinances.

Is this a proof of your position? Does that prove that it was not a spiritual church? You know it does not. You are too well posted not to know that that is no argument at all. But it is a favorite point—one of their best points in their own estimation. So we will expose that also, as we can and will expose every objection he can offer.

1. Then he knows that bad men crept into the organized form of the church (1) in Paul’s day, Gal. i. 4, (2) in Jude’s day

v. 4, 9 (3) in Peter's day, 2Peter ii. 1, 9, 12-15,(4) in John's day Epistle of John verses 9, 11. Then by your argument there was no spiritual church then.

2. In your church to-day—in all our churches, in the sense we now use the term—as organized and officered bodies, bad men are in, and often just as many as were at times found in the Jewish “congregations of the righteous.” So you prove too much again.

3. As now, so then, laws did exist—those to which Christ pointedly alludes, and presumes all who heard him to be familiar with them, when he tells us just how to weed out men out of the church, Matt. xviii. 17. If our officers in the church neglect duty; if the majority of bad men get in and suppress good discipline, and encourage carnal security, it is no more than the texts we just gave prove, existed in John's, Jude's, Paul's and Peter's day. We have this treasure in earthen vessels, and to man is committed the duty, under God, of executing his laws.

We have answered, more than answered, and utterly overturned and exterminated the whole platform of the Doctor, sapped his foundation and exploded his whole theory. Our arguments stand as firm as the everlasting hills—unshaken—unscathed, their pyramids of moral grandeur and strength resting on God's eternal truth.

He introduces analogy now, after such bitter, invective, against all arguments of analogy. Look at it. We have not brought in a single argument founded on analogy yet—not one. But the Doctor charged that we relied on analogy between the Jewish and so-called Christian Church. We did no such thing. No analogy came up. We want no analogy. It is *oneness* we proved. Analogy implies two separate things. That is the very thing we have opposed all the time. The church is one. It is a unity. It is one in its Founder, one in faith. Rom. iv. 3-5, 11, 12, 16; Eph. iv. 5, 6—we “walk in the steps of that faith of our Father Abraham,” “who is the Father of us all—iv. 12, 16—one in the Spirit, one in principle.

Now, when a man of the Doctor's strength has to so misstate our positions, our views, get up so many trivial objections, does it not argue the weakness and desperation of his cause?

But he says, in his "analogy," a change in the Constitution of Missouri, does so and so. It does not imply any change in citizenship. If it does such a thing, it must be clearly, definitely stated—the clause pointed out, and fairly understood. You can never disfranchise people of long established and recognized rights, by loose, vague inference, or construction of laws, especially those made where that matter was not at all under consideration, nor in the legislator's mind. Yet he relies wholly on just such constructions of the merest incidental occurrences and remarks in apostolic history. But does a change in Missouri's Constitution make a *de novo* State? Surely it does not. It is the same State yet. So his own illustration is directly against him.

He says Carson did not call it church. He does call it church over and again, as well as Bunyan, and all Baptist writers. On pages 233, 234, Dr. Carson repeatedly uses such phrases as "the church," "Jewish church," "the church of Israel," "was the church into which its members were born, the same with the church whose members must be born from above!" You call it as A. Campbell—"commonwealth," we presume. Paul calls the church, in his day, "the commonwealth of Israel"—Eph. ii. 12, and Gentiles were not in it, but "aliens" from it, by being without Christ—having no hope.

He berates Bishops, Presidents, etc., generally, but as it has nothing to do with our question, we let it all pass.

Limborch, etc., object that there is no record or proof that the "Apostles ever baptized an infant." Does that prove anything? He knows it does not. We will wait and see if he regards it as of any force, and if he does, it will go down with the same crash with which all else he has advanced goes down before the grand battle-axe of truth.

The Doctor gets wild, and charges that I am liable to impeachment on the Discipline! Not much. Not a word of our

Discipline do I reject. I do not subscribe to some applications or interpretations of fact and texts of Scripture attempted to be made by the framers of the Ritual, but he knows that is left perfectly to our liberty of conscience, not meant as a rule of faith at all. The note tells how it may be read, used, or "some other suitable address." We go by the Discipline, not by the ritual.

Finally, the Doctor elaborated learnedly the Greek word for church, *ecclesia*. But all that is answered by the fact

1. That this word in the New Testament is taken directly from the Greek Old Testament, as he too well knows, whose Greek Old Testament he knows the Apostles habitually used, and not from classic Greek. The Apostles never went to Athens and Greece to preach where classic Greek would be used, and the use of it he points out in Athens for ten years to thirteen after Pentecost. It is a shameful imposition to pretend to go to an Athenian assembly to interpret a plain Bible word in use fifteen hundred years by the Jews, and used by Jews to Jews, as it is in the New Testament. Where is any classic Greek that uses church as Christ does, Matt. xvi. 18, the first time it occurs in the New Testament, "I will build, (*oikodomæso*), I will establish, confirm, my church?" or in Eph. ii, 21, 22; Col. i, 18, 24; 1 Tim. iii, 15; Acts xx, 28, 29?

2. The Apostles were Galileans, used the Syriac as their native tongue, and knew nothing of Greek, save the Bible Greek, as we now study it. James uses the word "synagogue," ii, 2, in same sense, as well as Paul frequently, and Christ, "where two or three are gathered together" in my name." The words "gathered together" is the verb of synagogue, which has essentially the same import exactly as to the outward gathering assembly or organized church that *ecclesia* has. They are repeatedly interchanged in the Bible, in the same sentences and verses. We gave examples in our first speech. So we saw the Apocryphal writings used the word church exactly as the New Testament uses it. It is used for God's whole church on earth, at times. It is used for a simple congregation at times, just as we now do. It is used

for the whole of God's people in heaven and earth in all ages, all times. Heb. xii, 24.

We have answered every point, every objection. We have crushed every position he took that antagonized ours. We showed there 1. Was a church. 2. It was spiritual. 3. It had all proper laws for discipline as we have now—those of the New Testament being every one the same as in the Old. 4. We showed infants were in the church by the command, will and legislation of God. 5. We showed they received baptism and circumcision, both symbolic ordinances. That 6. This church is still God's church. He must 1. Find chapter and verse where it was definitely, clearly destroyed. 2. Where a new church came into its place. 3. This new church, so radically different from the old, as that it legislates the infants out of its entire pale. 4. Show where our duty to little children is explained; how performed outside of the church. These things he has not done, he never will do it.—
[*Time out.*

DR. GRAVES' FOURTH REPLY.

Replication.

MR. PRESIDENT:—This is the second day of the discussion of this simple proposition. Is Infant Baptism, as practiced by the M. E Church, authorized by the word of God?

Now my opponent has declared and put it on the printed page, that the commission of Christ to his Apostles is *the only* law we have to baptize any one. That commission is found in the New Testament. He will scarcely deny this, though he could as easily and as plausibly if he should see fit, as he denies that the Christian church and Christian baptism are New Testament institutions.

This being the only law in the Bible for the baptism of infants, if they are to be baptized, is it strange then that I should call upon him and urge him to come to it, and let us settle the question by it. If it is the *only* law for baptizing infants, why go back four thousand years into the mists and fogs of obsolete dispensations and Judaism for a gospel institution? That's why I have so stoutly objected to spending days investigating the Old Testament when every Bible reader knows, what Eld. Ditzler declares, that there is not a law in the Old Testament for infant baptism or an example of it; and consequently, no authority whatever to justify its practice in the Gospel dispensation.

But this, Sir, is the second day, and has he even *read* or so much as referred to, that *only* law in the Bible for the baptism of infants? Not once! Has he brought forward one precept in the New Testament that he even claims authorizes it? Not one. Has he produced an example in the New Testament of the baptism of an infant? Not one. Has he found a promise to any parent who would baptize his infant, or a threatening if he failed to do so? Not one. But he complains because I am unwilling for him to have the whole range of the

Old Testament, and he quotes scripture to prove that it, as well as the New, is "profitable for doctrine." Very well, he has been on it for four speeches, and has he found it profitable to his cause? Has he found a command in it for Infant Baptism? Not one. An example of it? Not one. Has he produced a prophecy that one day it would be practiced in the church under the Gospel dispensation? Not one. He certainly has not found it profitable to his baptism. What has he been trying to do all this time? He tells us, to establish the theory, that there was a true gospel Church in the Old Testament, but he will not specifically tell us what it is; sometimes it is "all the saved by grace; sometimes it seems to be "the family of Abraham," then again the "Church in the wilderness;" the Jewish nation and kingdom of Israel, "the remnant," etc., and this is his last trial, which he has just declared to be "the *completest analysis* of the whole church we [he] ever saw." I quote the whole paragraph, word and point of it:

3. "He utterly ignores the point we made, viz: that the church is *one, covering all ages, all classes, all dispensations*. Hence the death of this or that member affects not its existence. It exists in *Heaven and earth*, in all ages, composed of *all God's people*, as we showed. Heb. xii, 24; Eph. iii, 13, 14. Hence, if *all the members on earth were to perish, the Church of God lives on* in its membership on high—its Head—Jesus Christ, and its saving principles. The moment any number of beings embraced Christ, the Head, received the Spirit, *they are a part of the one church.*"

Now I appeal to all, is this the *fanciful, mythical* unsubstantial thing which he has been confusing the minds of his people with the past day, the organization, the body we have under discussion? Is it the body which the xxv art. of his Discipline defines as the church? Eld. Ditzler knows that it is not. He knows that this family of God in Heaven has no specific organization, and his own living Bishop Doggett, tells us that without that specific organization delineated in the New Testament, there can be no church, though any number of Christians may compose the body. This mystical family in Heaven has no laws, no ordinances, without which there can be no Church of Christ. To this church, no living infant ever belonged. What does he mean by such a definition? Can it be that he believes he can impose it upon this people?

But those passages he quotes do not refer to a church in Heaven. Rom. xii. 22, refers to the visible organized church of living beings *on this earth*. So says A. Clarke. So Dean Alford. Eph. iii, 14, 15, does not in the slightest manner refer to the Christian Church, or to any church anywhere, but states that the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is the Father of all in heaven and on earth—of angels as well as men—that all his intelligent creatures belong to his family and named from and by Him, and therefore to this All Father the Apostle bends his knees and prays for the brethren at Ephesus. Now, if he claims that there is a church in heaven, where God is, though it has nothing to do with *this* question, I shall urge him to find a Scripture that teaches it. These, manifestly, do not. This sort of controversy is not discussing this question. I do think I have cause to complain that my opponent has spent one day and almost half of another, in discussing issues not in debate, and now I think I have cause to protest against his course. He has not defined, and he persistently refuses to define what he means by a visible Church of Christ, nor will he publicly endorse the definition of "Church" in the Articles of his Discipline. What does this mean? He says infants were circumcised under the Old Testament. This statement is not logically true. It is an universal affirmative, and means all infants under the Old Testament were circumcised, but this is not the case, but very few, and they of the family of Abraham, were circumcised, and not all of Abraham's own children, but only his male infants were circumcised. What possible connection has this rite with water baptism under the Christian Church? If any, it can only apply to the *male* infants of some parent or parents who stand in the same relation to his children as Abraham did to his.

Circumcision was applicable, and did mean something to Abraham's infants, but to the children of no other family, while Christian baptism is inapplicable to the infants of any one, because its design cannot be answered. Circumcision was a sign to the male child, that he was a descendant of Abraham, and entitled it to all the temporal blessings secured in the covenant, of which it was the token, and it was *typical*, prefiguring to him the great spiritual fact of the necessity of

a circumcised heart, for him to be a spiritual child of Abraham, and enjoy with Abraham all the blessings secured to him in that covenant. There is no conceivable connection or relation between circumcision and baptism, the former belonged exclusively to the male children of one man, and secured to them temporal distinctions and blessings only, while baptism is a profession of a personal saving faith in Christ, and of any one, and of any family under the whole heaven, and introduces into the visible church. The former rite every male *inherited* by reason of birth; the condition of the latter is personal faith in Christ.

He says that besides the ordinance of circumcision, the church in the Old Testament had a baptism! If it had, it is evidently not the church he is talking about, for that had no ritual, he tells us! How can such a disputant be answered? Eld. Ditzler declares that the covenant God made with Abraham was the constitution and *foundation* of the church he contends for. THEN THERE WAS NO CHURCH BEFORE THIS COVENANT, or there was a building before there was a foundation for it to rest on! But were there not thousands of pious persons that were saved by grace from Abel to Abraham? Then without casting reflection upon God's government, there can be thousands of Christians in the world during two thousand years without there being a church in any sense! But during these two thousand years, thousands of the saved by grace died, and went to heaven, according to Eld. Ditzler's belief, and yet there was no church in heaven either, for the first two thousand years of the earth's history! Well, if this be so, then there is little need for him to call on us to reconcile it with God's government, that he should not see fit to call such an organization as a church into existence until the expiration of one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight years more, when His own Son should set it up for his own purpose. This is a fatal position to my opponent's theory, and he has made a still more fatal one, which I will notice in its proper connection.

I wish to gratify him to the utmost by way of explaining the Word of God to him, and others may be benefitted. He says:—

"Next he errs on covenant, if we understood him. If he says the cove-

nant between God and Abraham was not the constitution and foundation of the church we traced, and which Paul names, Heb. ii, 12; xii, 24; Eph. iii, 13, 14, under family, then let him explain what *was* the constitution of it, and *what* the foundation of their faith when seeking a city that had foundations, Heb. x, 38, 39; xi entire; xii, 1-3, 22-24, *all we point.*"

Well, we did say that if the covenant God made with Abraham, recorded in Gen. xi, and sealed with a token, Gen., xvii, was the covenant of grace or redemption, and did call a church into being, as my friend declares, then was the covenant of redemption made with an idolater as its head, since all its first members were idolaters, and no infant in it at that! I was showing the absurdity, not to say profanity of my opponent's position. I will now tell him that Heb. ii, 12, the prophecy of David concerning *Christ*, is a prophecy that could not be fulfilled until Christ should come, for his hands and his feet were never before pierced, and never before His advent did He sing a hymn of praise in the midst of his church, but the fact of the fulfillment is put on record by the evangelists—i. e., that after the supper he sang a hymn with his disciples, and went out to the Mount of Olives. Heb. xii. 24. I have shown and proved by Adam Clarke and Dean Alford, and the ripest criticism of the age, that it refers to the visible church of the gospel dispensation as opposed to the politico-religious organization, the Jewish Church, which Eld Ditzler claims as the true church, identical with his own.

Eph. iii. 14. has not the most distant reference to any *church* above or below, only declares that God is the common Father of all the holy unfallen intelligences, of all angels as well as of Jesus Christ, Heb. x. 38, and xi, and neither mentions nor refers to any church, above or below; nor does Heb. xiii. 1-3, 22, 25, as I have fully shown. Thus have I disposed of his *proof texts*, and while I wait for more, or a representative of these, I will briefly notice some assertions and requests he made at the close of his speech yesterday evening.

1. He affirmed that he had met every point I have made against this theory! Those who heard and those who may read the record must decide this. Has he so much as defined the visible church which we are discussing? He has not, but affirms that all the saved constitute the church. Has he en-

lorsed the definition of his Discipline even? Has he informed us when and with whom the Covenant of Redemption was first made?

2. He says, I "have not met a single point, no, not one point." Others must and will judge of this. I proved that before the coming of Christ there was no real Church, and consequently it could have no ordinances or infants. I proved by Paul's declaration, Gal. 4, and Heb. xii, that the Jewish nation was only a type or figure of the visible kingdom of Christ, and this, be it known to all men, is all that Carson, Gale, or any Baptist known or heard of by us ever admitted. Whoever says Carson or Gale taught that there was a visible Christian church before Christ's advent, grossly misrepresents them.

He calls upon me to answer clearly six questions. See how cheerfully I do it at the earliest moment, hoping my example will provoke him to pay some attention to my requests.

1. "When was the old church done away?"

It never had an existence to be done away.

2. "Reconcile this with God's government."

No reconciliation is needed except according to the doctrines taught in the Methodist Standards of belief that God cannot save men, not even infants in the ordinary way without a visible church and the ordinance of baptism. But my opponent now admits there was no church before the days of Abraham, i. e., for nearly 2000 years, and I will ask him how he can reconcile this fact with God's government! And he says

3. "Reconcile it with the prophecies of perpetuity everywhere given to that church, quoted by us in our two opening speeches; he has not dared attempt it."

He quoted many passages in his two speeches, that applied to various and different persons and things, but not one passage prophesying perpetuity to any thing in the Old Testament which he claims to be a visible church. If he claims that, he has the issue made up. Let him when he rises, present the passages and I will at once notice them. Is not this fair?

4. "Let him show when and where the *new* church was organized."

Aye! this is how he attempts to shift the burden of proof. It is not incumbent on me, but on him to show where the church of Christ was organized in which unconscious infants were entitled to baptism and membership. I have all along denied that there was any *new* church; it would be admitting that there was an *old* one under Judaism. I can and shall tell him by and by when the Gospel dispensation commenced Mark i. 1. I shall ere long tell him when the kingdom of heaven long prophesied of, was "at hand." I shall ere long tell him when the law and the Prophets ended, and the kingdom of heaven was preached. I shall presently tell him when the rite of Christian baptism was first instituted, and there and then we must look for the legal subjects of it.

"5. Let him reconcile that with all the texts we quoted against its possibility, and as Matt. xxi. 43, e. g."

He can quote no passage against the possibility of Christ's setting up his church and kingdom as David prophesied, as we will see in due time.

WAS THERE A CHURCH IN THE FAMILY OF ISAAC.

If one was ever constituted or was in existence in his family, it must have been when God renewed the covenant with him. Read Gen. xxvi, 2. At this time his family consisted of his wife Rebecca, an ambitious and intriguing woman, and his two sons, Esau, the wild man, and Jacob, the supplanter. So far as the record informs us, Isaac must have been the only truly righteous or justified one—Esau was *profane*, and Jacob an intriguer and a falsifier. At least this is all we need to know. There were no infant children in Isaac's Church, except those among his idolatrous servants.

WAS THERE A CHURCH IN JACOB'S FAMILY?

If any, it must have been when the covenant of his father, Abraham, was confirmed unto him for a law, to a thousand generations. This is recorded in Gen. xxviii.

Jacob was evidently an unconverted man—at this time—and, unfortunately for the theory, he was unmarried, and with-

out slaves, so that he was the only member of it! If there was no church in the family of Abraham, it is certainly useless to look for one in the families of Isaac and of Jacob.

The Covenant of Circumcision, while it marked the families, constituted no church out of the family of Abraham, Isaac or Jacob. If, therefore, there was no church under the Old Dispensation, where is the ground for an analogy, or for even an inference to the New?

The great Peter Edwards, the renowned champion of infant baptism, says :

"Sure enough there can be no analogy between a church and no church, and consequently no argument can be drawn in favor of infant membership from a church that never was, to a church that now exists."—*Candid Reasons*, p. 99.

Follow the history of Abraham's descendants from the day he circumcised Isaac, down to Egypt, and thence to Mount Sinai, in Arabia, and you can find not the shadow of either a *nation* or a *church*, but a *family* only.

So much for the church under the first three dispensations, Eden, Antediluvian and Patriarchal. I cannot see how any candid Christian man can believe that during the first twenty-five hundred and fifteen years of the world's history that there existed for one day a visible organization of regenerate persons and regenerated infants that answers to the definition of a Christian church as laid down in the Methodist Discipline. Catholicism has its myths as certainly as did the religions of Greece and Rome, and this Christian church, with regenerate or unregenerate infants incorporated in it by the Covenant of Grace, is the grand and astounding myth of Protestantism. This myth was invented for the want of a better support and ground for infant baptism.

Mark, as I have said before, I do not deny that there were hundreds and thousands of holy men and women who "feared God and wrought righteousness" in every age of the world, "for God hath not left himself without witnesses" of his goodness, faith and power, but I do deny that it was his will or intent that they should be organized into a visible church. There could be thousands of Christians in any nation and yet

be no church, as there were once five hundred Masons in San Francisco before there was one organized lodge. Ten thousand Masons will be present at Philadelphia on the fourth of July, 1876, but no intelligent Mason would think of calling these a lodge, and claim that during the month of July there was a lodge of ten thousand Masons in Philadelphia. To constitute a lodge it requires, as it does a church, *organization*, with fixed laws and powers, etc.

The church of God, Eld. Ditzler will himself admit, is an *institution*—he calls it an institution—and he knows that an institution cannot be originated without express and specific appointment by the authority that has the power to appoint or institute, as circumcision, as the passover, as the ceremonial law, as Christian Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

Dr. Goodman, when writing against Popery, says:

"The term institution implies a setting up *de novo*, or appointing that to become a duty which was not knowable, or at least not known to be so before it became so appointed."—Pres. vs. Popery. p. 7.

And Dr. Sherlock, when writing against Popery, says:

"I will never admit of a mere consequence to prove an institution, which must be delivered in plain terms, as all laws ought to be."—Pres. vs. Popery, vol. ii. Am. Ed. p. 23.

So I urge these laws against Pedobaptism. I now call upon Eld. Ditzler to state clearly and explicitly the law or specific command that originated his church that he says existed thousands of years before circumcision or bestial sacrifices. I press him for his precept originating it then or before the incarnation. And as he goes out to hunt for the law, I will furnish him with a few more of those logical arguments from which he has heretofore hidden as from missiles of death.

Refutation.

ARG. XIV (1) That practice which opens a door to any human traditions, additions, changes, or innovations in God's worship, is a sin and an abomination in the sight of God, and a curse to the world.

"The principle," says Dr. Owen, "that the church hath power to institute and appoint any thing or ceremony belonging to the worship of God, either as to *matter* or to *manner* beyond the orderly observance of such circumstances as necessarily attend such ordinances as Christ himself has

instituted, lies at the bottom of all the horrible superstitions and wars that have for so long a season spread themselves over the face of the Christian world.’’

(2) But the practice of Infant Sprinkling does open a wide door to any human tradition, addition or change in the ordinances of God; for, though it was never instituted by Christ, the Romanists, who made the change, declare and opened the door to, the use of the sign of the cross, exorcism, salt, chrism, God-fathers and God-mothers, and sponsors, the consecration of the baptismal waters, confirmation, the offering of prayers and oblations for the dead, the mass, extreme unction, and a host of other innovations.

Not even do Catholics, but Protestants, even Prof. Stuart himself, who stood for many years at the head of all the Pedobaptist writers in America, admits that it was instituted by man, and he defends it upon the ground that the church has a right to change the non-essential ordinances, and make them conform to man’s convenience!! How wide this open door! for the right to add one implies the right to add or change a thousand! There remains no bar to any innovation a corrupt church might choose to introduce.

(3) Therefore the institution of Infant Baptism is a tradition of man, a sin, and an abomination in the sight of God, and a curse to the church and the world.

A curse to the church because it corrupts and carnalizes it, and to the world because it teaches men to believe and trust in the traditions of men rather than in the commands and ordinances of God.

ARG. XV. (1) The Lord purposed only the saved to be added to the church, and to add the unsaved is to contravene his expressed purpose—“and the Lord added to the church daily the saved.” *Tous soudzomeneous*, those who are saved, Acts ii. 47.

(2) But living infants and unbelieving children are not saved.

(3) Therefore to add them to the church is to contravene the express purpose of God.

ARG. XVI. (1) Whatever practice inverts the order of the Divine Law of baptism is a perversion of the Divine Law, and is, therefore, sinful.

(2) Infant Baptism does this by practically putting—in direct opposition to what the commission requires—baptism before *faith* or teaching.

(3) Therefore Infant Baptism is a perversion of the Divine Law.—[*Time Out.*]

DR. DITZLER'S FIFTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS :—As the practices of a people throw light on the difficult passages we find in their writings, so here, in the well known practices and customs of the Jews, we will find a further means of understanding the commission. The following facts are admitted by our opponents—that the Jews practiced Infant Baptism on the children of all proselytes at the beginning of the third century. Thus Dr. Judd, Baptist, copied by Dr. Graves, says: “Independently of the scriptures we have evidence that ought to satisfy us, that, at the commencement of the third century, the custom of proselyte baptism was practiced among the Jews,” p. 243, Appendix. The Jerusalem Talmud Judd quotes, 220 A. B., mentions it, and seems to agree that Roman soldiers received it during the time of the second temple; 243. To these points M. Stuart agrees, in substance, p. 122-20.

But while our opponents are compelled to put it thus early they admit, as Judd does, the force of facts and testimony that puts it immediately after the era of the birth of Christ. On the contrary, all the most learned in Jewish literature, Lightfoot, Seldon, Buxtorff, Schætgenius, Danz, Wetstein, Witsius, Kuinœ, Beza, etc., believe it was practiced long before the apostolic age. Ernesti, Bauer, Paulus, M. Stuart, etc., think it came in after the apostolic times. The proofs favoring this, are, first, “The original institution of admitting Jews to the covenant, and strangers to the same, prescribed no other rite than that of circumcision;” Judd, 243. Second, no account of any other is found in the Old Testament; none in the Apocrypha, New Testament, Targum’s of Onkelos, Jonathan, etc., Judd, 243.

M. Stuart urges that the silence of Onkelos, Philo, Josephus and Jonathan, is proof it did not exist before Christ: p. 128; but admits it existed in the second century, if we may credit

the Jerusalem Talmud; p. 128. See Judd on the same—silence of these men; p. 241.

Here, as so often on the baptismal question, the matter is superficially examined. With the Bible open before us, we know that the above objections are utterly untrue. In 2. Chron. xxx, 15, 27, the people did not come with due preparation, though circumcised; and it was against the law to take the passover thus. The New Testament shows clearly, as well as Lev. xi: 25,36; Num. xix: 9, 18; Lev. xv. and xvi, entire, that the unclean would not dare to approach the passover, or come into the assembly of the people. Psalms xxiv: "Who shall stand in the congregation of the upright? The clean of hands," etc., is based on that fact.

Exodus xxii: 47. All the congregation of Israel shall keep it.

48. And when a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it: and he shall be as one that is born in the land; for no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof.

49. One law shall be to him that is homeborn, and unto the stranger that sojourneth among you.

Num. ix: 14. And if a stranger shall sojourn among you, and will keep the passover unto the Lord; according to the ordinance of the passover, and according to the manner thereof, so shall he do: ye shall have one ordinance, both for the stranger, and for him that was born in the land.

Num. xv: 15. One ordinance shall be both for you of the congregation, and also for the stranger that sojourneth with you, an ordinance forever in your generations: as ye are, so shall the stranger be, before the Lord.

One law and one manner shall be for you, and for the stranger that sojourneth with you.

It is here laid down that native Jews and proselytes shall be under one law. That was settled from the beginning of the exodus of the Jews. That "according to the manner thereof," all alike were to be qualified to take it. No unclean, unbaptized Jew, could take it according to law. Hence, of all absurdities, it is the most absurd to suppose that the Jews would allow Gentiles to take the passover, or come into the assemblies of the righteous, unbaptized. And this enables us to understand the teachings of John iii: 5. Christ is simply declaring a well known fact there; not a new law of His kingdom. Nicodemus, you Jews hold—we all hold that every

one must be baptized who enters our church, as well as profess faith in God as a pure Spirit, by which he becomes as one new born, "born of the Spirit." See Lightfoot. He had to be born of water and the Spirit to be entitled to entrance, as a proselyte or Gentile. Christ simply relates an existing fact. In verse 10, he shows that he is talking of matters that ought to be familiar to the Rabbi. "Art thou a master, (*ho Didaskilos*) the teacher of Israel, and knowest not these things?" The ordinary baptism was familiar, but the Rabbi had lost sight of the spiritual. Men were born of circumcision; received the rite of it; born of water, received the rite of baptism.

John i. 25 "Why baptizest thou, then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet?"

That is, when such an one comes, and baptizes, he is making proselytes. It is certain, then, that Jews required all converts, to always baptize their children of all ages. Hence the Jerusalem Mishna, which existed long before Christ, though not reduced to the written form till later, names that if a girl, born of heathen parents, be made a proselyte after she be three years and a day old, then she is not to have such and such privileges there mentioned. The Babylon edition says: "If she be made a proselyte before that age, she shall have the said privileges;" Wahl i. 10. The later Gerna, in commenting on it, says:

"They are wont to baptize such a proselyte in infancy, upon the profession of the house of judgment, for this is for its good;" *ibid.* "If an Israelite take a Gentile child, or find a Gentile infant, and baptizes it in the name of a proselyte, behold he is a proselyte." Quotations could be multiplied, but it is useless. See Wall, Lightfoot's *Hore Hebraicæ*, etc., vol. 1; Selden's *Opera*, vol. 1; Witsius *Oecon. Fied. Dei*, etc.

It is said the silence of Josephus, Onkelos, Jonathan, and Justin Martyr on it, is against its existence.

1st. None of these had occasion to name it, specially

2d. The silence of such writers is no proof. Eusebius, Theodoset, Hippolytus, Socrates, Evagrius, Sojoman, and hosts of others who lived when all admit it existed, never name it. Nay, many of the fathers never name it, though they lived where it existed.

3d. Onkelos and Jonathan are simply translators, the one of the Pentateuch, the other of the prophets, and had no occa-

sion of naming it. But unquestionably Josephus refers to it incidentally War of the Jews, xi. 8, 7; Stuart, 136. He tells us of those joining their sect, how they are held off till a year; put to a test; then they are "made partakers of those purer waters which are designed for purification." But Stuart says, the Essenes, wash their bodies in cold [with cold] water, etc. This is mere twaddle. What if they do? Was that a proof that proselytes were not baptized? But my proof is in the Bible, already adduced. As to not naming a thing of that kind, the apostolic church practiced infant circumcision; yet it is not named in all their history and epistles where an infant was circumcised, where John baptized a woman, or the twelve apostles baptized anybody.

The Jews baptized their infants. They were accustomed to it for ages. The commission was given to a people accustomed thus to disciple. Hence the commission (Matt. xxviii: 19, 20) could be understood in no other way than as embracing infants. A special command to baptize infants was wholly unnecessary under the circumstances.

Notice first, the commission is to the Jews, Matt. x. They operate, renovate the church, call the people to repentance and faith. Then the final commission—disciple all nations—*ta ethnee*—all the Gentiles as well as Jews, baptizing them; teaching them to observe all things etc.

Let us now examine the language.

As Alford, Bengel, Olshausen, Kuinöl, Wahl and Stier maintain, and the majority of most eminent critics, the word rendered teach, (*mathæteusate*) does not mean here to teach, or give previous instruction. The (*didaskontes*) teaching comes after, no period named, and sense and experience or well known habit would govern.

Matt. iv. 18, 22; ix. 9, show that Christ enrolled disciples without any previous teaching, and they were adults. He certainly can expound his words to us most appropriately.

2. Tim. iii. 15, 16, Timothy, from a child, (*apo brephoi*), from infancy, knew the Scriptures. He had been taught in infancy, four years old. In Num. iii. 27, 28, eight thousand,

six hundred infants, one month old and upwards, were enrolled "keeping the charge of the sanctuary," to be taught from infancy, their religious duties. Here they were enrolled as learners, disciples, and though not teachable for several years yet they are disciplined at a month old. Then, from Moses till Christ, every Gentile disciplined to the Jewish church, always brought in his infants with him. This was universal; constant in all the Jewish Israel for one thousand, five hundred years. This is worth a thousand opinions of men on these things.

Now, then, with these precedents, that every case of discipling a Gentile, during 1,500 years, including all his infant children; no exception, ever; Christ a Jew, to twelve apostles, Jews, sends them out to "disciple(*ta ethnee*) the Gentiles;" how would they understand it? The commission is thus to be explained. It was, therefore, as much a command to baptize infants, as it was to baptize any at all. No class is specified; none expressly named; they were to carry it out as they had always practiced.

You have fully seen, Gentlemen Moderators, that the Doctor relies wholly on mere quibbles and dodges on this proposition. He now asserts again that I would not define the church. We venture to say that more pains never were taken to define the church; and a more elaborate definition never has been given, that we know of by any writer, nay, not by *half*, as we gave in our first and second speeches. They will show for themselves. But, as he *cannot meet them*, he *must* do something—so he *denies* all. That is easy work. He calls for it in writing. I had it written out—read it all, and as such it goes to print. If he desires, I will copy it off for him.

He parades logic. Alas for logic, if it depends on a mere parade of the word with all of Hamlet left out. Where is the logic? Logic compels acceptance of your conclusions, if you accept the terms of the Proposition. But the terms must be conclusive—true. Not a single syllogism has he framed but would dissolve like mist or frost before the bright sun of truth. In each—in all he has begged the question. Is *that* logic? He *assumes* the *very thing* in dispute. Is *that* logic?

Against my position that infants are innocent, though inheriting a fallen nature, he urges our Discipline that, "they are born in sin." By that he ought to know we all teach that we simply mean they are depraved in their nature—not actually guilty; for so both Wesley, Watson and Fletcher, with great force and clearness explain. Watson and Fletcher elaborate it with great force. Indeed, they were *the men* who first brought that question out of the mist and darkness in which it had been left by the superstitions that had accumulated about it. And after torturing their words into meanings, never on earth dreamed of by those fair-minded and great men, he pretends to say they taught that infants "deserved damnation!" He knows they were the only men who boldly taught that all infants are saved—so says Watson pointedly in the Institutes repeatedly—so says Wesley in his sermon on David's child in simplest manner; so says Fletcher pointedly—so says the whole volume of our system of theology; but while we were thus preaching against the old *iron-clad* systems of which Dr. Graves' is a *relic*, Baptists—especially all that wing from which he professes descent, were preaching all over England and the American Colonies—every man of them, that *hell was peopled with infants*, many of them not a *span long*! Many of them preached it till the last forty or fifty years? Plenty of people yet living, heard them preach it.

I said infants were innocent—say so still, but did not say the rest *he* says I said, so I let it go.

He reads the so-called Wesley's Tract. He, knows, doubtless, that :

1. Wesley never wrote that Tract. He says, in so many words, he did not, and marked it not to be published as such.

2. He knows *we never* did publish it in our church.

3. He knows that Methodists NEVER DID, NEVER CAN, teach such sentiments as that disgusting Tract contains. God forbid that Methodists and Baptists should be responsible for all the jargon and trash that some old dotard publishers and Rip Van Winkles publish.

4. He knows the M. E. Church has long since so publicly repudiated it, as to order it *not* published, as through the

sheer half-idiocy of some old sleeper, it got into print in America, and have superseded it with a different work *in toto*.

But of course Dr. Graves, as a partizan, has the right to say what Methodists believe—not we. Our Bishops may assert, and the bosom friend of Wesley, as he did, may publish, and Wesley assert that he never wrote that tract, yet, of course Dr. Graves knows they all utter an untruth! They shall be the author, and responsible for it. Well done, Dr. Graves—stick to it!

He still harps on *politico*—theocracy. Well, when he finds it so called by Paul repeatedly, by Christ, James, Stephen and by *Jehovah*, as often as we showed they called God's Zion, his "heritage" "the church"—"THE CHURCH OF JEHOVAH"—and Jehovah all orthodox writers agree was *Christ*—it will do. Till then we can smile at his failures. He says again the church was founded on circumcision. When (1.) he proves it, we will respond. 2. When he meets just *one* of the crushing refutations of it we presented in our last speech, we may be ready with as much more.

But now he brings up charges and specifications against Old Testament Saints! We thought that field was monopolized by Tom Paine long ago. He urges they were not such as would do for the church now! Me! What a Godly people then! Paul did not know that, or he would have been saved the awful blunder of writing the *eleventh* chapter of Hebrews. Alas for fame! *Peter* never did wrong in the New Testament church, did he? Judas never acted badly. Diotrophes, 3d John, ix, 11; the parties in Gal. ii, 4; Jude iv, 9, were all good innocents, as well as Hymeneus and Alexander, Satan's favorite friends, who figured in the church in Paul's day. We have no bad fellows in any of our churches now, no Rebeccas, no Isaacs. Oh! happy times!

He urges that Masons can only make Masons by a regular Lodge, hence runs the analogy.

1. Notice here he again needs *analogy*, uses the very thing he so fiercely condemns.

2. It destroys his position. Let us suppose all Lodges were under civil wars, prosecutions, etc., disbanded, not an organ-

ized Lodge in America or the world. But there are plenty of Masons. The storm sweeps by. Now we ask, will not these Masons come together and promptly organize themselves into Lodges and be as legitimate as ever existed? His illustration is thus deadly against him. So, were all the congregations of God's people scattered and disorganized. It would not destroy the church, not for a moment. As Masonry survives in the principles it inculcates, so Christianity lives in the imperishability—the indestructibility of its principles, and as long as they live, the church of God will live.

If I am made to say in the Louisville Debate that infants are not “persons,” it was the error of the reporter, as mine made many errors, and lost over half of what I did say on Infant Baptism, as any one who hears me speak must know, who sees how short my speeches are, especially the first seven.

But, sir, we repeat—what has the Doctor done? He has relied solely on special pleading. Not a single effort to establish a consistent thread of argument to offset or overthrow our position—he has simply relied on filing the most contradictory objections, seven-tenths of which lie with equal weight against his own church. *The infants are in yet—he can't get them out.*—[*Time Out.*]

DR. GRAVES' FIFTH REPLY.

Replication.

MR. PRESIDENT:—I wish to call the attention of all to the two facts that by this time must begin to make an impression upon all minds. 1. That my opponent has just finished two days more—five elaborate speeches, and has not produced one precept for, or example of, Infant Baptism in the Old or New Testaments—nor has he claimed to have done so. This is one fact that speaks volumes. Do not all before me believe that he would have brought forward a passage, if he had had one—if he knew of one that offered the semblance of authority for it? Mark when he comes to the last proposition, how many scripture texts he will quote in his first speech—and in every speech—to teach falling from grace, because he believes they afford some plausible support to his faith, but why has he not, in two days claimed even one passage in the New and Old Testaments to authorize Infant Baptism? He admits it is an institution either of Judaism or Christianity, and if so, it has an express enacting law somewhere—for an institution in the absence of law cannot be *inferred*. If he can find no law or clear example of it, he can find no authority for it in God's word, and therefore up to this hour he has none—nothing to support the proposition, *i. e.*, to prove that “Infant Baptism is authorized by the Word of God.”

2. The next fact that must have astonished you all, is that in his last speech he has left the Word of God altogether and fallen back upon Proselyte Baptism, to find the *origin and support* of Infant Baptism! Is not this a loud practical declaration that he cannot find either in the Bible? I shall notice this argument which I esteem the forlorn hope of Infant Baptism, in connection with John's baptism, where it justly belongs commiserating however the urgent stress in which my opponent so soon finds himself as to resort to this refuge so early

in the conflict. But, suppose I should grant that Proselyte baptism was practiced long before Christ's advent, and that Infant Baptism was originated in or by it, what follows?—Proselyte baptism was never anything but a tradition of the Elders, it was not instituted by God, and there he is confessing to you that Infant Baptism is a tradition of Judaism! Is this proving that it is authorized by the Word of God? He cannot do his cause greater injury than to spend his time on Proselyte baptism—

3. Another fact which I see from the very faces of his friends when I speak of it, begins to give them anxious thought. He has refused to give a definition of a visible church, an earthly organization that has the ordinance of baptism in it! The thing he has defined as a church, is what is known in theology as the invisible church, that as Elder Ditzler says may be perfect, irrespective of rites of any kind, and may not *have a living member on earth! Is that the church?* He tells you that the main strength of his argument for Infant Baptism is to prove there were infants in all ages in this invisible church which he calls the general assembly, and church of the first-born in heaven—the whole family of God wherever on earth—and yet he says that baptism nor any other rite is a condition of membership in this church. How then does the fact that there have always been infants in that invisible church prove that they have been baptized! or that Infant Baptism as practiced by the M. E. Church is authorized by the Word of God! And yet he tells you how much he has done. That he has already put in all his arguments—and this is *true*—that he has at last struck his rock, adamant—Proselyte Baptism—that our opponent cannot remove or shake—I will show you that it is a reef under his own keel that he has struck. You will notice that this is the last speech in which he will attempt to lead—he will fall behind and attempt to pick up here and there the scattered fragments of his broken vessel.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to call your attention, and that of every one, to several important, and singular admissions he has made in answer to my direct questions.

I asked him if he meant by "Covenant of Grace," what is generally understood as the Covenant of Redemption? and he has answered affirmatively. This is correct and clear.

I asked him to state *when, where, and with whom* it was *first* made? He has answered, immediately after the fall in the Garden of *Eden*, and to Eve,* the mother of all flesh, substantially or in essence, when God said to her that her seed should bruise the serpent's head.

I asked him if that covenant, when first made or announced, originated his church, which he stood here to defend? He has answered that it did.

These answers more clearly disclose the real foundation of my friend's theory by which he brings all children into his church, and consequently, if only carried out, *the whole world* in one generation. The first rock of this foundation is laid upon a theological falsehood, an absurdity—*i. e.*, that the Covenant of Grace was made with mortal, sinful flesh, or with any created being! The whole tenor of the Word of God is directly against this assumption. Why, sir, the race had fallen into irretrievable moral and spiritual bankruptcy and ruin, temporal and eternal. It was wholly without strength or ability. It was utterly irresponsible, and therefore unable to enter into covenant to perform any condition. No, sir, if there is the least ray of hope for any one of Adam's race, it is the glorious Gospel fact that help was laid on one that was mighty to save, that the Covenant of Redemption was made by the Father with the Son, and that before the world was. This grand fundamental truth no orthodox theologian, or Christian, ever denied or ever will deny.

I propose to develop this covenant with the true purport of each covenant of the Old Testament, whenever I can get my opponent to commence the work, which before we came here, he privately promised me he would do in this discussion, that we might find which, if any, supported Infant Baptism.

*NOTE.—I see in looking over Elder Ditzler's speech since it has been set up to be published, that he has omitted his answers to my questions, as I have indicated in my speech. That he did say that the Covenant of Grace or Redemption was first made with, or announced to, Eve in the Garden, the notes of the reporter will show, and every impartial man who heard him will testify.

J. R. GRAVES.

We mutually agreed that they had not been thoroughly discussed in previous debates, and that the people generally had no clear apprehension of them. Elder Ditzler having run over all his ground will, I trust, in his next speech come back to the thorough discussion of the covenants, or surrender them. It was the Father who made the Covenant of Redemption with "His chosen," his Son, and gave Him a seed, a people to be saved, that no man can number with the stipulated conditions. It was the Son who became the party contractor for the seed He laid hold of, engaging himself to perform all the conditions of that covenant, so that he might become the Savior, the Redeemer of his people.

No, and let every one who hopes to be saved write it upon his heart. "THE COVENANT OF REDEMPTION, OR GRACE, WAS NEVER MADE WITH ANY MORTAL OR CREATED BEING!"

But he says it was in substance, essence, made with Eve when God said to her, that her seed should bruise the serpent's head. Is not this a singular asseption from one who never makes a mistake about facts! This language, which he calls the covenant, was not addressed to Eve at all, but to the serpent—to *Satan*—himself!! Therefore the covenant of grace was first made with the devil, and, therefore, if it developed or called a church into existence, Satan was, by covenant, made the federal head of it! And its only members in the garden, in the Eden church, were Satan and two poor, fallen, depraved sinners, Adam and Eve; but, alas, not a babe or a child in it! And this is my opponent's church! that has come down in unbroken, continuity! of which he is a member, and the accredited champion! What fearful, fatal admissions! What a terrible foundation to build a church upon! Does Infant Baptism require this defense? Thus have I glycerined the very foundation of his system. I have showed that, if there was a spiritual church, in Abel's day, in *heaven* or *earth*, visible or invisible, *he was the only member of it*, and when Cain slew him, he destroyed both the visible and invisible church, with one and the same blow! and thus his *continuity* was broken—staple and chain being crushed.

Where next does he start his church? He comes down 2033

years, leaving the world without a church, and starts one with Abraham, and strange to say, asserts that the Covenant of Redemption was made with Abraham, when a sinner and idolater! and what will make the ears of every Christian to tingle, and his eyes open with wonder, asserts that Jesus Christ became surety to Abraham for the Father that the promises of that Covenant should be fulfilled!! I have heard many wild, incoherent, and absurd things advanced by professed ministers of the gospel and teachers of Christianity, but, save Eld. Ditzler's declaration, that the Covenant of Grace was first made or announced to Eve in the garden, I never heard anything so astonishing as this. It would be denied by Eld. Ditzler and his friends, after the heat of this discussion is over, if not placed on the printed page, and endorsed by him.

I will quote his words, letter and point. In his second speech you will find these words.

The covenant of redemption was, that made with Abraham."

"*Christ had become surety to Abraham for the Father that the promises should be fulfilled—'by so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament'—(Heb. viii, 22).*

I confess myself bewildered by the strangeness—the unscripturalness and irreligiousness of such statements. I have said what every intelligent Christian knows, that the covenant of redemption was not made with mortal flesh—not even Adam, with whom God made a covenant of works in respect to which he failed and involved his whole seed—but God made it with "his chosen"—the second Adam, who took not hold of, engaged not for, the seed of Adam, but the seed of Abraham, and it was as party contractor in this covenant of redemption that Christ became *surety to his Father* for his people of the seed of Abraham—the sheep the father gave him to save and to keep.

It is not the responsible, but the irresponsible party that needs a surety—security. Not the loaner but the irresponsible borrower of money, that needs a surety—some one to become his security.

But all this will be considered fully when Eld. Ditzler con-

sents to enter upon the full discussion of the covenants. But he now commences his church with Abraham as its Head, and his family as its members, taking the family as a unit, and the sort of church it was, I developed in my last speech. My opponent and many writers do not seem impressed with the fact that when the Covenant of Promise was first made with Abraham, for it was the self-same covenant, renewed and enlarged, when confirmed by its seal to Abraham and a token to all his descendants; when Abraham was beyond the flood in the land of Ur of the Chaldees, an idolater, as all his fathers were—Josh. xxiv. 3. We read in Gen. xii. 1, the promises of the covenant which God made with Abraham *before* he crossed the Euphrates, and when an idolater—though my opponent, as many do, refers to this promise or covenant, as the Covenant of Grace, made after Abraham had entered Canaan and become justified by faith in the Christ God revealed to him. It is too wild and absurd a statement to notice, that the Covenant of Redemption was made with a wicked idolater, and that Jesus, whom Abraham at this time did not know, became to this idolater a surety that God, whom Abraham did not know, would fulfill the promises of it.

The time has certainly come, and I now urge my opponent to develop his views of this covenant and tell us how he can bring the children of all into the church of the gospel dispensation by it—and make, if possible, a little more clear the *identity* and continuity of this church of two idolaters without infants or children—with the spiritual church of the New Dispensation! I wait for it.

To his assertion that I rely “wholly on quibbles and dodges,” I reply. Those who hear us, and those who read the record, will decide this—one thing is certain, if I have quibbled or dodged, Elder Ditzler has failed to show it as plainly as he failed in showing anything *silly* in my logical arguments—yes, as *signally* as he failed in his attempt to construct a *logical syllogism*!

Two little things more before I proceed with my examination of the Old Testament.

1. He declares that Wesley never wrote the Tract on Bap-

tism published in Doctrinal Tracts—and that his church is not responsible for its sentiments, etc., and that I know it, etc. What are the facts in the case that I *do* know. (1). That on July 5th, 1832, the Methodist book concern issued a collection of tracts, titled “Doctrinal Tracts.” In the “advertisement” I read this :

“Several new Tracts are included in this volume, and Mr. Wesley’s Short Treatise on Baptism is substituted in the place of the extract from Mr. Edwards on that subject.”

It must be supposed that the Book Committee knew whose work they were publishing—they said it was Mr. Wesley’s. They published this essay as Mr. Wesley’s until 1861, when they substituted another tract in lieu of it—that makes direct war on Baptists—but do they say that they do so because they disapprove the doctrinal sentiments of the essay, or because they have found out that it is not Mr. Wesley’s? No, but they, in 1861, say that it is “Mr. Wesley’s treatise.”

They published and circulated it twenty-nine years for Mr. Wesley’s work—they still publish to the world that it is Mr. Wesley’s, but Eld. Ditzler, without a word of *proof* says it is not Mr. Wesley’s! Whom will you believe? But what matters it whether the man Jno. Wesley or some unknown man wrote it—it has received the highest and fullest endorsement of the Methodist Episcopal Church for twenty-nine years and the Methodist Episcopal Church South, circulated it. *It was never left out until a book entitled the Great Iron Wheel had been published five years.*

Heretofore, no man presumed to deny the statements of the M. E. Church, that Wesley wrote the Treatise but Methodist preachers, putting the last edition in the hands of their people, have taught them to deny that such sentiments as I have quoted, were ever in the Doctrinal Tracts, putting our people to the trouble and expense of getting the editions, previous to 1861, to show that the author of the Great Iron Wheel, and other Baptists, had not misrepresented the published sentiments of Methodists. This matter is at last settled. Eld. Ditzler, with the book before him, does not deny that it was taught in the Doctrinal Tracts previous to 1861; that, “if infants are guilty of original sin, *then* they are the proper

subjects of baptism; seeing, in the ordinary way, THEY CANNOT BE SAVED UNLESS THIS BE WASHED AWAY BY BAPTISM;" and these words also: "Baptism is the ordinary instrument of our justification," and by baptism we receive, "the washing away the guilt of original sin, by the application of the merits of Christ's death." * * "by baptism, we, who are by nature the children of wrath, are made the children of God."

"And this regeneration which our church in so many places ascribes to baptism is more than barely being admitted into the church, though commonly connected therewith; being 'grafted into the body of Christ's church, we are made the children of God by adoption and grace.'"—Doc. Tra., page 248.

Now my opponent seeks to break the force of my argument and turn attention from the teachings of his own church, by charging that my people once preached "all over in England and the American Colonies—every man of them—that hell was peopled with infants, many of them not a span long." Eld. Ditzler is not the *first* Methodist preacher who has charged this upon the denomination with which I stand connected—for I know of none but Methodist preachers who ever made this charge—it is peculiarly a Methodist calumny, that has been, from its first utterance, met with a flat contradiction—charged as a slander, and proof demanded, one solitary instance where a regular Baptist minister ever taught the fearful horrible doctrine in the Doctrinal Tracts above quoted, or any thing akin to it, but no proof has ever been presented, or can be, and yet Eld. Ditzler stands here before you and repeats the calumny. It is utterly false and *impossible*. I demand for the honor of my people that he here and now produce the proof of his statement, or, it will fall heavily upon his own head—that he has deliberately "taken up," repeated and endorsed a false report against my people, and it will follow his name so long as the record of this discussion is read.

But before I close what I have to say upon this proposition, I will show you that infant Baptism was originated by those who believed with Mr. Wesley, that no infant could be saved without baptism, and I will show you that it has been perpetuated from then until now, in order to secure or make certain the salvation of infants.

I will now push forward my search for a church in the old dispensation.

We come now to the time when God saw fit to fulfill one of the temporal promises in the Covenant of Circumcision. Up to this time the descendants of Abraham have been considered as a *family*. Now God is going to make of the Twelve Tribes, not a church, but "A Great Nation."

Under the direction of the Most High, Moses led his people out of the land of Egypt, "the house of their bondage, to the shores of the Red Sea, and stretching out his rod over the Sea, its waters divided on the right hand and on the left from shore to shore, and the Israelites entered into the midst of the sea and disappeared from human sight, and were thus "immersed into Moses in the cloud, and in the sea." They thus accepted him as their deliverer and their law-giver and their guide. This baptism was a figurative profession of their *faith* in him, in the promises of God proclaimed unto them by him. This act did not constitute them into a church—for they were a body of idolaters—Moses was leading them to the foot of Mt. Sinai to meet with God. Here God gave them "the Law of Commandments," written on two tables of stone, and the "Law of Ordinances," which together is called The Law, and entered into a covenant with them, and by this covenant they were for the first time constituted into a Nation—a Theocracy—with a written constitution and laws. This covenant is called throughout the New Testament, the Law, the "first Testament"—the Old Testament, and by theological writers the *Sinaitic Covenant*. Though God gave them a civil government and a system of religion with numerous carnal ordinances, He did not thereby constitute them into a visible Christian church.

He did not make regeneration of heart a condition of citizenship in this kingdom, nor did he make it a qualification for the enjoyment of any civil or religious ordinance, not even to the office of a priest.

The teachings of my opponent are misleading on this point. You must remember that it is absolutely necessary to his argument, it is *vital* to the theory on which his church rests that he constructs or sets up a church and a Christian church rich

here. You all see that he will not have so much as a particle of sand to stand on, unless he can prove that this people but yesterday a crowd of slaves, subject to the kings of Egypt, and debased by the degrading idolatry of the Egyptians, is here recognized as a church of faithful men.

I do not deny that God required of them all to love Him, and to serve Him, and to obey both tables of the Law, but He did not make this a condition of citizenship, nor even a qualification for any Civil or priestly office. The Sinaitic Covenant constituted the Twelve Tribes of Israel into one Nation—*E pluribus unum*—and nothing more.

It was no more a Christian church than the Germanic confederation is a church—or, than the thirty-four States of this Union are a church, or would be a Christian church. Suppose it should adopt Romanism or Methodism as the State religion and the Congress with the President should ordain and appoint all the priests and pay them out of the public treasury. It would be a *politico-religious* government but not a church. Elder Ditzler knows as well as I, that such was the character of the Jewish commonwealth under Moses. You remember his declaration, “no one can be a member of the church in any sense unless regenerated,” “justified by faith in Christ.”

It was not required of these recently emancipated slaves, idolaters in heart, to possess this qualification to be embraced in the constitution of the commonwealth and enjoy citizenship in the Jewish nation, and every man in this house knows it.

But suppose I grant, which I do not, a church here and onward until Christ came no infant, as such, was ever in it, according to Elder Ditzler, because no unconscious infant ever was “justified by faith”—was ever “in Christ” and therefore never in this church or any church.

That the Jewish nation under the Sinaitic constitution did have a certain relation to the church under the Gospel Dispensation, which caused Stephen to speak of it as the “*ecclesia in eramin*”—church in the wilderness, I am free to admit; but what that relation was, though not incumbent upon me, I will show in my explication of the two covenants as time may permit. My solitary business now is to explode my oppo-

ment's theory of church identity, from which he *infers* infant baptism. If I demonstrate as I thus far have done, that there was no church in the Old Testament, his theory falls and his inference wont draw. For as Peter Edwards says, "between a church that never existed and an existing one, there can be no analogy."

I now apply the *reductio ad absurdum* to his argument based on the Jewish nation—as identical with the Christian church. It is a fallacious and dangerous argument for *it proves too much*.

If, because we find infants in the old Jewish commonwealth, we may introduce them therefore into the Christian church, because the church possesses essentially the same character under all dispensations.

Then what follows!—A hundred and one traditions of the Papacy, as the union of Church and State. This is the very argument that all Pedobaptists in the old world are wont to use to maintain the iniquitous union of Church and State, and the sword in the hands of the Civil Magistrate to enforce the faith and exterminate heretics, and this was the very argument that Episcopalians in old Virginia used, and the Puritans in New England, to imprison, whip, and persecute Baptists and Quakers. I say through this very door that my opponent would open to let infants into the church, rush in all Romish rites and traditions that Protestants as well as Baptists so much oppose, a human priesthood, altars and sacrifices, etc., etc. Catholics use Eld. Ditzler's very arguments. "Our worship must be of the same nature and kind with the Jewish worship, because it was to succeed it."

But I propose now to let a few of the more distinguished advocates of Infant Baptism demolish this Jewish Church identity as a tenable ground for Infant Baptism or any other practice in the Church of Christ.

J. G. MANLY.—"Whatever be the nature of the Christian Ministry and the method of Christian worship, we should not look for their origin and model in the weak and beggarly elements of a superseded system, but in the New Testament itself, which alone is the record and rule of the church of Christ. Judaism had no church, either national or otherwise." "The stereotyped verbiage and transcriptive absurdity of justifying nation-

al churchism by Judaism, should at once and forever cease." "No one that understands the relation of Christianity to Judaism, can suppose for a moment that the former is, or ought to be, modeled after the latter.—The better is not moulded by the less. The superior and permanent is not copied from the inferior and abrogated. Day is not the imitation of moonlight. Antitypes do not take their shape and hue from types. If Judaism is to be our model, we ought to *abolish the church* and make the nation everything."—[*Eccle.*, pp. 222, 223, 226.]

Dr. HALLEY, in *reply* to Dr. Wardlaw, says: "Another objection to the reasoning of my friend, which appears to me to nullify his argument, is, that the visible or national church of Israel was the creation, not of the Abrahamic covenant, but of the Mosaic law." "The national church of Israel was abolished with the Mosaic law." "If he means by the former dispensation the Mosaic law, with its national church, it is forever abolished and its constitution is irrelevant to the argument."—[pp. 144, 145.]

Dr. WARDLAW, on *State Establishments of Christianity*, says what can truthfully be applied to the advocates of Infant Baptism as justified by God's covenant with Abraham. "Few things are more surprising than the use that has been made of" circumcision and God's covenant with Abraham "to elicit from" them "an indication of the will of God" respecting the appointed subjects of Christian baptism—"the amount of ingenious theorizing that has been expended upon it."

Dr. A. CLARKE, Meth. "*They which are the children of the flesh*, etc. Whence it appears that not the children who descend from Abraham's loins, nor those who were circumcised as he was, nor even those whom he might expect and desire, are therefore the church and people of God."—*Com.*, on Rom. ix 8.

Mr. PAYNE, on evidence of the popish mass, says: "I come now to the New Testament, where, if there be any proof of the sacrifice of the mass, it is more likely to find them than in the Old; yet they produce twice as many more, such as they are, out of that than this, and, like some other persons, are more beholden to dark types and obscure prophecies of the Old Testament to make out their principles, than to the clear light of the gospel, and to any plain places in the New; and yet, if any such doctrine as this were to be received by Christians, and if any such wonderful and essential part of worship were appointed by Christ, or taught and practiced by the apostles, we should surely have it more plainly set down in the New Testament than they were able to show it."—*Pres. ag. Po.*, p. 64.

JAMES OWEN.—"No argument can be drawn from the ceremonial law to the gospel, because we are not under the obligation of that law."—*His. of Images, &c.*, p. 107.

B. H. COOPER's words are as applicable to infant Baptism as to religious establishments. He says: "It is in vain, therefore, to cite the precedent of the Jewish theocracy in defence of religious establishments; and to whine out the complaint that to antiquate this precedent is to rob a Chris-

tian king of his only chart of duty which might direct him in his capacity of a sovereign."—*Free Ch.*, &c., pp., 63, 64.

Dr. J. STACEY, Meth.—"Baptism and the Lord's Supper were not Jewish, but Christian—not a brief continuation of the past, but a regulative commencement of the future. They were not observed as modified rites of an old, but as distinguishing signs of a new dispensation."—*The Sac.*, p. 272.

Dr. WARDLAW, I adduce in reply to himself and others. He says, "that the Jewish constitution was entirely *sui generis*, instituted by Jehovah for special purposes, never by Him intended to be, nor indeed capable of being imitated:—that in the primary constitution of the Christian church there was an actual departure from it, and a complete change of system—such a change as makes it manifest, if any thing can, that every attempt to set up the former as a pattern, or plead it as an example, is what I have called, a presumptuous and preposterous return to that which is abolished, and an overthrowing, in its very spirit and principle, of the constitution of the kingdom of Christ, as originally delivered to His apostles by its supreme and only Head." (*The Scr. Arg.*, p. 31). He has before said (p. 14): "We are not entitled to alter and to modify Divine examples. If they are meant for our imitation at all, we should regard them as they are—not taking a part and leaving a part—following what accords with our notions of expediency, and declining the rest."

J. A. JAMES.—As to the argument which is founded upon the Constitution of the Jewish Theocracy, we consider it so irrelevant and inapplicable, that the very attempt to bring it forward in support of a Christian institute, betrays at once the weakness of the cause."—*On Diss.*, p. 10.

Dr. J. STOUGHTON, instead of teaching that the apostles were so inherently, abundantly, and necessarily Jewish, that, after they had received the baptism of the Spirit, they could conceive of and practice nothing but what accorded with the historic past says, "A Christian church, in some of its most essential points, was, after all, a perfectly new institute, in immeasurable advance of anything which the Jews before had witnessed, or been taught to conceive." (*Ages of Chris.*, p. 37). Also in *Ecclesia*, he says: "The Jewish church was in certain respects, and those the most characteristic and striking, so utterly different from the churches instituted by the Apostles, that a combination of the principles of the first, with the principles of the second, is simply impossible. New Testament precedents may be set aside for the sake of adopting Old Testament examples;—the system pursued by the early Christians may be exchanged for the system practiced by the House of Israel; but the one can never be modified by the other. It is a question not of modification, but of revolution; as we see at once when we compare the principle features of the one, with what were the prominent marks of the other" (p. 20). Again (p. 22), "Can the ecclesiastical constitution of Judaism be harmoniously incorporated with the Apostolic institutions of Christianity? The true answer is unquestionably in the negative."

J. LOCKE.—"Nobody is born a member of any church; otherwise the

religion of parents would descend unto children by the same right of inheritance as their temporal estates, and every one would hold his faith by the same tenure he does his land; than which nothing can be imagined more absurd."—*Works*, vol. vi, p. 13.

Dr. E. DE PRESSENSE.—"Christian baptism does not transmit itself by right of inheritance any more than faith."

All these are Pedobaptists, and standard writers, and I do hope that Christian Pedobaptists will hear their voice and abandon the practice, until they can find authority for it in the New Testament.

Refutation.

I conclude my refutation of the "church identity" theory, which is the entire authority for Infant Baptism, with following arguments :

ARG. XVII. (1). Christ declared that his kingdom was not of this world, else his subjects would fight for him, i. e., with carnal weapons.

(2). But, the Jewish kingdom was of this world—a politico-religious government—and the subjects of it did fight for their kings with carnal weapons.

Ergo—(3). The Jewish kingdom was not the kingdom or church of Christ.

ARG. XVIII. (1). Paul said, by the Holy Spirit that "flesh and blood" carnally minded men, cannot inherit the kingdom of God.

(2). But flesh and blood, carnal men, did inherit the old Jewish commonwealth.

(3). Ergo The old Jewish Commonwealth was not the literal kingdom of God.

ARG. XIX. (1). That which is already in existence cannot be brought into existence, and that which is already set up cannot be set up.

If the kingdom of God was set up by the Abrahamic or the Sinaitic Covenant, and *had never ceased to exist*, it could not be again set up or brought into existence as Daniel prophesied it should be subsequent to his time.

Ergo—(3). The kingdom of God that Daniel prophesied of, which was the visible church of Christ, was not an institution that had been set up in the days of Abraham, or Moses.

DR. DITZLER'S SIXTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—We will now review some matters, as we have in, all the evidence we want. Now he admits I gave a definition of the church, in his fifth reply, but *it is too long*. Well, why did he so stoutly deny I gave one?

“There is no *visible* church if scattered abroad!” What of it? There is *God’s church*, and the moment they can meet together, and organize, there is a visible church, and its rights and privileges all grow out of those given to *the whole* invisible, spiritual church of God. But Dr. Graves has stoutly *denied* there was an invisible church. *Now* he is compelled to fall back on it, as we knew he would be. Abel, Enoch, etc., were all members of that *one* church. *It cannot be* destroyed. In any age or all ages, any of its subjects dispersed or not, may organize or meet, and they form a *visible* representation of the great family of God. How could it be otherwise? Christ gave the pledge of eternal presence to his people.

“Every infant has to be washed in the blood of Christ,” he tells us, if he dies. But do not *adults* have to have the merit of the same *after* regeneration, nay, till death, *daily* applied? So *they* are depraved yet. So the infant has to have no more of that than regenerate adults. What processes adults and infants pass through, is not revealed to us, and I do not propose to speculate outside *the record*.

He says we published Wesley’s Tract “till the last year or two.” Why will Dr. Graves persist in unseemly talk? Did he ever see an edition *later* than 1836? That is *forty* years ago. I never saw but two or three copies in my life—they, save one, were in the hands of our bitterest enemies. Now he *knows* *we*—my church—never did publish it. The M. E. Church long since repudiated it, never did teach what it contains; but the silly old publisher thought it was *Wesley’s Tract*, and like many dotards supposed if it was, it must be published. But

you can look at his argument in that Tract on Romans, vi. 4. He denies it is immersion out and out. Now Wesley, you quoted, says it is an allusion to immersion. That Tract says it is not. It not only is proved to be not his by external proofs, Wesley's own denial among them, but by *internal*. Do *you* endorse Bunyan's Open Communion? O! no. Do not your people still publish *all* Bunyan's works? Even if Wesley had written such a Tract in an earlier day, then rejected, and we all reject, would we not do as *you* do? Do you accept the creed published by the Baptists of *your* wing in 1646 almost word for word the same in *all* doctrines, as the Presbyterian Confession? Do you still hold that "*elect* infants" are saved? and all the old rigid points of that creed? Here *you* have been charging, repudiating, and going back on all your ancestry, while we have never changed on a single point of faith. We have never been compelled to repudiate, revise, revamp and burnish up again. Why? Because *ALWAYS correct*—stand in *the Bible as a whole*. But we do not propose to let the Doctor off just here. He has often told us of "*the Controversialist*," as if in good sooth he had not been wearing war paint or polkberry juice all over his face from the days I was a lad, dangling bloody scalps from his belt, in which hung the knife and hatchet, bloody from fierce execution. Do you not see—mark the *real* partisan? We have allowed *him* to expound Baptist verity. We could show where he runs against Ripley, Bunyan, Helwys, the real founder in the Calvinistic wing of his church, and Carson. But we had a representative, endorsed man—accepted *his* exposition as that of Baptists here. Has *he* done so by our church? No. He knows what we teach. He has mis-stated us *every* time. Why this persistent course? It argues desperation: To go clear under in such a contest, is unpleasant. Hence he feels called upon to fight for life itself. As I have all my proof in, that I need, if he chooses this method, we lose nothing.

But *here* is an argument—hear it. "It is worth your hearing, Hal." Dr. Graves urges if *all* are baptized, you cannot carry out the commission, for there would none be left to disciple! I heard that when a child from a plain old "disciple"

farmer, and it amazed me then ; but little did I dream a great debater would use it.

By the same rule all men ought not to be converted and saved, for there would be left no one to enable us to carry out the commission ! All men ought not to repent and be converted and be baptized lest the commission be a nullity. Well, Doctor, we console you with this, if *all* were baptized—all infants—we believe you would not have many years to rest in before there would still be a demand for your services.

He urges that Philip demanded a confession of the Eunuch, Acts viii. 37, before he baptized him. Does he not know that the 37 verse, that so called confession, is a forgery ? that it is so glaring a forgery that A. Campbell, Anderson, Wilson, all, threw it out of their immersion versions ? Yet it is not in any ancient Bible or Version only where it has been incorporated by late hands in inferior MSS. Hence it is not in any correct Greek Text.

He urges that Jesus is the foundation of the church. Exactly so ; so we showed, far, far beyond what he has attempted. He was “the founder and finisher of the faith” through which Abel, Enoch and Abraham—Moses and all were saved. So the same Apostle he quotes on Eph., ii., tells us. Dr. Graves has not once even alluded to that part of my argument.

He tells us when John and Christ came they were looking for a new kingdom. Where is the proof ? We read where they wished to know if he came “at this time to restore again the kingdom.” Acts i. 6.

So loosely does the Doctor put matters.

He says John now preached repentance towards God—he baptized none but believers—none but those who received him. I am a preacher of a new order of things—the ax is laid to the root of the tree. “The Doctor goes through the motion of John swinging his heavy ax—great work—a new church, we presume, is now to arise.

He says “now all stood on individuality.” Such is, in brief, the account he gives of John to prove that the Jewish people were not a church and now a real reform was at hand. He

tells us that it was the death of the whole old system. Now—

1. Always men stood on their own responsibility, as the Old Testament repeatedly tells us. That was not new.

2. John preached. So did Isaiah, Jeremiah and all the Prophets—and every whit as good preaching, as you will not deny. The truth is, but for John's relation to the Messiah his preaching was of the lowest order a Prophet ever uttered; for he openly avers his inferior position. He merely baptizes with water—emphasizes the "*with water*" every time. Even the twelve Apostles are exalted far above that. Paul boasts that he was not sent to baptize. Yet a calling that Apostles did not come down to as a rule, was John's main office—

2. He baptized—not really penitent believers in Christ, but "unto repentance." Anderson has it "in order to repentance." It looked *eis* to repentance—a mental aim. As they had not repented, they were not believers in Jesus.

3. Luke and Matthew put it in proof that this was the case. Read Luke iii. 15 to 20, and you see that those John was baptizing were in expectation—that is waiting turn to be baptized, Yet "were in doubt whether John were the Christ or not." Here the people he baptized, (1). Were denounced as vipers. (2). Baptized unto repentance, (3). Were in doubt, (4). They believed John was the Christ. Is that the great work to be done?

Matthew ix, 14 says—"Then came to him (Christ) the Disciples of John, saying, why do we and the Pharisees fast oft, but thy disciples fast not?" Hereafter John's baptism is over, his disciples come to Jesus and (1) Mark themselves as not being the disciples of Jesus, (2) They rank themselves with "the Pharisees" as in opposition to Jesus' disciples.

And that is a new church is it? That is the great reformation of individual responsibility!

4. The Evangelists and John himself put it in evidence that John's work was merely a cleaner of brush out of the way—a herald, whose only value was his heralding some one of real value. Luke iii. 16–17, he tells how Christ should baptize with the spirit—with fire. That his work therefore would be

thorough. His fan is in his hand—he will thoroughly purge his floor. See the contrast. Now all prophecy told that Jesus Messiah would suddenly come—suddenly appear in Zion—in his house—“sit as a refiner’s fire”—“appear in his temple”—and as a Repairer, a “Restorer”—so here he “thoroughly purges his floor”—casts out the bond woman with her sons of mere ritualistic religion—who “stumble,” “fall,” are “broken off”—“cast away”—he “thoroughly purges” his church, sits “as a refiner of gold.” But where does he make a new church, a new floor, while purging the old one. It is only in this way he makes all things new.

The good Doctor told us, while so warmed over John’s ministry, that he told them “they could not inherit religion!” Did he? And that was his new mission! So we understand that when Moses preached—“Love God with all your soul, mind, heart, strength, your neighbor as yourself,” it simply meant you naturally inherit these elements of character and dispositions of heart. When David prayed (Psalm li. 1, 2, 7, 10)—“blot out my iniquities, wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin. Purge me with hyssop, wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow. Create”—O what a strong word!—“create in me a clean heart.” Ah, says Dr. Graves, in that day all that was matter of inheritance, it came like Dogberry’s learning to write—of nature.

Isaiah tells them though their sins be as scarlet—red like crimson—yet they should be as wool—white as snow. God would be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and iniquities he would remember no more. “Seek the Lord while he may be found; call upon him while he is near. Let the wicked forsake his way, the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him turn unto the Lord, who will have mercy upon him, and to our God, and he will abundantly pardon.” Why, says Dr. Graves, all that comes by nature, by inheritance. That is nothing to what our Harbinger did—he said, “I baptize you with water unto repentance!” Dr. Graves, do you believe that the religion of Abel, Enoch, Abraham, Moses, Elijah, David, Isaiah, etc., etc., was not as we now have it, but a mere inheritance of the flesh? No you don’t. Then why not stand

up for God's truth if it does crush your errors? Does not Paul tell us that we, Abraham and David are all pardoned in exactly the same way? Rom. iv. 2-9. Does he not add then that we Gentiles are justified as was Abraham, and hence "walk in the steps"—how very precise—Yes, sir, "in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham"—"who is [thus becomes] the father of us all." verse 16. Why then seek to make so damaging a charge against, and fix a blot on the character of the Almighty, merely to support an untenable dogma? Why talk about religion "coming down by genealogy?" That Pharisees should err is one thing, but that God should have so blundered and pretended to teach for 4,000 years that religion "came down by genealogy," is vastly different.

On John iii. 4-7: "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit," we deny to *to see* (*edein*) means there, "to form a conception"—be "born from above to see it," for many reasons.

1. It says "be born of the water and the Spirit," and this to enter into the kingdom. The water here, which you make baptism, precedes the birth of the Spirit. "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom," etc. So that destroys your interpretation and application in toto. *Edein* here means to enjoy, participate in. Hence we propose to examine this whole context and see its true import.

JOHN III, 5—BORN OF WATER AND SPIRIT.

Immersionists sometimes appeal to John iii, 5; "Except a man (*tis*, any one) be born of (*ex i. e. ek*) water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," to prove that envelopment in water, and proceeding out of it, is here alluded to, and favors their theory. To this we reply,

1. If "born" (*gennæthæ*) here implies proceeding out of the element, it proves too much; for he is "*born of water and the Spirit.*" Does it mean the unregenerate were enveloped in the Spirit, and to be born of it, is to emerge out of it, be out of its influence. We thought it implied just the *reverse*. Hence, this is fatal to the immersion theory.

2. The word "born" used of spiritual matters has no al-

lusion whatever to natural birth as to female relation, but *always* to the male relation, and is rendered more properly by A. Campbell, Anderson and others, in most of its occurrences, "*begotten*." It is born or begotten of God, of the Spirit. It relates wholly to the spiritual process by which a new and higher life is imparted to us by God's Spirit. It is foolish and coarse to run the analogy between it and natural birth. Hence

3. The Jews used the phrase, "born of circumcision."—That is, they received circumcision. We are begotten of the Spirit when it is shed on us, poured upon us. We are born of the water, it marks or indicates a transition to spiritual life as a symbol, when the water is poured on us in baptism.

We feel it a duty here, though not germane to our subject, to give what we believe to be the true meaning of this noted and much abused part of Scripture.

JOHN III, 5, EXPLAINED.

The Rabbi meets Christ at night, a favorable time to communicate with him alone perhaps, for two reasons. (1). To frankly admit that the Rabbis felt the force of his claims in the miracles he performed. (2). To learn all he could about his mission. Hence he says we know thou art a teacher come from God—i. e. from above. Christ replies solemnly, "Except any one (*tis*) be born from above (*another*, it *never* means 'again'). he cannot (*edein*) enjoy the kingdom of God." A spiritual birth is necessary to see into and enjoy the mysteries of God's kingdom. See Psalms li, 10-12, 15; cxix, 18. Ezek. xxxvi, 25, 26, etc. Jer. xxxi, 31.

Nicodemus may have alluded (verse 4) to natural birth because that introduced Jews into the kingdom, aliens had not these privileges except by adoption into the Jewish kingdom. Jesus then replies "Except any one be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." That is to say, you Jews, being members of the kingdom, must be born from above to enjoy and realize its benefits, and the law demands of every alien baptism and a spiritual birth on entering it.

That we may now discover the true meaning of this, let us see the errors of the parties giving it applications it will not

bear. We freely admit 1. That every leading word is more or less ambiguous—capable of various renderings. Hence it is unsafe to rest one's faith on any dogmatic view of the subject.

(1). *Gennao* (*gennao*) is rendered born and begotten by all immersionists. (2) Water is held by Calvin, Beza, Zwingli, etc., to refer to spiritual life, not baptism. (3) Others that it is Jewish baptism. (4) Others, that it is Christian baptism. (5) It, to our mind, clearly refers to Jewish proselyte baptism. (6) The kingdom is referred to the Christian visible church by many (7) By many it is referred to the general church. (8) By others, to the kingdom of heaven. (9) By others to the church below and that above. If men differ so widely on three of the words of the text—nine different views—is it not unsafe to risk our faith on any view of it? but look to other passages free from doubt.

2. We must notice the contrast between verses 3 and 5—*see, enter* into. Verse 3 barely implies that the birth from above is necessary to enjoy the kingdom. Verse 5 declares being born of water and the Spirit necessary to enter into the kingdom. Why this great change, from enjoy the benefit of as *see* (*edein*) implies and means here to enter into, where baptism comes in.

This brings up a question of *fact*, historic facts. (1) It was not a fact that Jews had to be born of water and the Spirit to enter into the kingdom. No birth of water was necessary to enter the Jewish church, to a Jew. As A. Campbell often says, they were born members of that kingdom." Christ and Paul recognize the fact, *e. g.* Math. viii, 11, 12; xxi, 43; Eph. ii, 11, 12, 19; Rom. xi, 24. All admit this fact, I believe.

(2). The Jews of Christ's day were familiar with the phrase, "kingdom of God"—"of heaven." Luke xiv, 15; xxiii, 42: i, 33, and said of those baptized—they are as "*a babe, new born.*"

3. Can this refer to entering the Christian church, as some rituals (*ours e. g.*) and A. Campbell and his people teach? And does it imply, as the latter party contend that baptism is an indispensable condition to entering the church and to being saved? This view is harsh and absurd, and is always abandoned whenever its advocates press the matter: for to

say that all unbaptized—especially as held by this party—all immersed people are damned, will meet with little support when the issue is squarely presented. If they adhere to it, then (1) All infants, heathens, etc., are damned. (2) All adults are damned though they be the holiest, purest, most devoted of men. This is the reverse of all Christ's teaching. (3) It contradicts the views of "the Disciples" and A Campbell, in that the parties had to "be born of the water and of the *Spirit* before entering the kingdom. But they unanimously teach the Spirit is not given to any but the immersed.

That we cannot receive the Spirit till pardoned—not pardoned till immersed, in which immersion the penitent believer is introduced into the kingdom, then receives the Spirit through the word. Hence their own dogmas directly contradict the verse.

4. The tenth verse shows that it was a historic Bible fact Christ was expounding. "Art thou a master of Israel—literally art thou (*ho didaskalos*) the teacher of Israel and know not these things?" How could Christ rebuke "the teacher of Israel" for ignorance of the being "born of water and of the Spirit" unless the fact were familiar to Jews—a well understood doctrine of their law and practices? Hence it could not refer to a future matter, *not yet* taught and acted on.

Indeed that is absurd. To suppose Christ, aside from this verse, to be dealing dishonestly, is far from creditable to him. It was not an unknown, future matter, He so earnestly presses, but an existing fact. Every word is in the present tense—a present necessity—"Ye must be born from above." "That which is born of the flesh, is born of the Spirit," not shall be, three years and six months hence! "The wind bloweth * * thou hearest"—present tense. "So is every one that is born of the Spirit"—a present truth.

In verses 14, 15, 16, Christ tells "the teacher" just what he, and all men, must do to secure this principle of eternal life that begets the same in us, whence the new life begins, and we are born of God as in all ages believers were. John i, 12, 13; 1 Cor. x. 3, 4.

We have these points made out then—

1. Christ does not refer to Christian baptism.
2. He does not refer to the common Jewish baptism, for it was not a condition of entering the church.
3. Yet it does refer to an existing fact. Hence,
4. Unquestionably he refers to Jewish proselyte baptism. This is evident.

1. Because it is not true of, and will not apply to any other view advanced or that can be advanced, yet

2. It does perfectly apply to it. It disposes of all the difficulties, all the ambiguities complained of.

A proselyte or Gentile could not enter the kingdom, as the Jews used the term, without baptism. But it is objected that the Bible nowhere required baptism of proselytes, and it was a later matter—of the third century after Christ. This shows the same superficial view of baptism and the whole baptismal question we will so often have to expose. God would not allow the Jews after Egyptian bondage to enter covenant without purification. The priests had to be baptized before entering on duties, Ex. xxx. 18–22. Every one defiled had to baptize, Num. xix. 9–22; Heb. ix. 10, 13, 19, 21; Mark xii. 4, etc. The Jews in Christ's day would not enter the public hall lest defilement disqualify for the Passover the next day. Is it reasonable that such a people, in Christ's day would allow Gentiles, the touch of whom required Jews to baptize, (Mark vii. 3–4; Num. xix. 9–22; Lev xi. 28–36, etc.) to enter the church unbaptized? Nothing could be more absurd. The objection of Baptist writers, and M. Stuart against the existence of proselyte baptism as we call it in Christ's day is most trifling. It is that Onkelos, Philo and Josephus do not name it. But neither do several Targums that were written years after all agree it did exist, viz: as early as A. D. 220. Jonathan Ben Uzziel never names it. Nay, Eusebius A. D. 338 never names it, nor do any of the fathers of five or six centuries though they treated on baptism, on Jewish affairs and ecclesiastical matters generally. Socrates, Theoderet, Evagrius, Sazoman,—writing in the fifth and sixth centuries the history of ecclesiastical matters, never name it.

How absurd then to object to, and reject it, because these three men did not name it. Onkelos could not, for he gives us simply a rigid translation of the Hebrew text into Chaldee. Yet this is the only argument against its existing in Christ's day!!

Christ does not object to the practice, but on the absolute importance of the spiritual birth. Nay, while he simply alludes to the customary baptism as a condition of entering the Jewish church, he five times introduces or reiterates the importance of the spiritual birth. It is an eternal truth, not a mere custom, or Jewish law. Being an established principle of Jewish law, all Jews being in, but not enjoying, for want of spiritual life, the kingdom, every Gentile—"any one" not in it, had to be born of water and the Spirit to enter and enjoy the kingdom. The (*edein*) already settled must not be dropped here at verse 5, but the two held together, so that to be baptized was necessary to entrance into the Jewish church, as a proselyte, and be born of the Spirit to enjoy its benefits. Then we have each word explained, and the force of it all.

Every proselyte had to renounce his Gentilism, profess faith in, and devotion to the God of the Hebrews—in him, as a Spirit, quickening and saving. Hence, Christ simply states an existing fact, in John iii. 5, nothing more. It was no dogma given to the church. Christ warns earnestly against trusting in the fleshly ordinance, verse 6,—“that which is born of the flesh (fleshly ordinance) is flesh”—man's body, circumcision as well as baptism, are called flesh. See Gal. iii. 3-6.

We have presented to you our views of this noted passage. No other explanation can we conceive of, that meets its language grammatically and fairly, will accord with the facts and intent of Scripture teaching.

And now we have been debating this proposition into the third day, and where has the Doctor made a point?

Our position still stands. There is the church, Stephen calls it the church, Paul calls it the church, David a hundred times calls it the church, Joel calls it the church, Jehovah calls it the church, Christ applies the words, the

church, to its local congregations twice—Math. xviii. 17, using it as it daily was used by the Jews for centuries.

Infants were in it. They received its ordinances. Let him now show where it was destroyed. See the words: cast out, fall away, rejected, cut off, stumbled, of accessions, added; all these terms occur in Apostolic records; he was to thoroughly purge his floor, come into his temple quickly, “strengthen the stakes, lengthen the cords,” as we do to enlarge a tent, for “the place is too narrow,” by reason of the incoming of the Gentiles. Is. xlix. entire *e. g.*, Rom. ix and x, entire, and Eph. ii. 16–20, thus he said, “I will establish, confirm my church.” Math. xvi. 18. Where has he succeeded in showing its destruction and a *de novo* new one in its place? He can’t do it.

Dr. Graves says John iii. 5, “is the law for entering the Christian church.” It does not name any church. It is not Christian baptism. Yet he puts his construction in the most metaphorical language possible, and lays that down as the law of Christ’s church.

We ask now:

1. Where did John, the Harbinger, ever organize the church?
2. Where did he organize and OFFICER any congregations?
3. Where did Christ, during his personal ministry, organize and officer churches?—[*Time out.*

DR. GRAVES' SIXTH REPLY

[NOTE BY REPORTER.—As Dr. Graves was about to commence, Eld. Ditzler motioned him to his seat, where a short conference was held, at the conclusion of which, Eld. Ditzler arose and said :

“We have agreed not to debate the question of the Covenants further, as I here express my conviction that the Covenants of the Old Testament have nothing to do with Infant Baptism.”

Dr. Graves—“I want it to be recorded along side of that **frank admission**, that I am rejoiced to hear him say this. The Old Testament Covenants have been the basis of this rite heretofore, and I am glad this ground is at last abandoned by Methodists. So much is gained by this discussion. From this day onward, so long as Eld. Ditzler bears the endorsement of the Bishops of his church, that he, is a representative of their doctrines, let no Methodist Elder or preacher in all the South, ever go back to the old covenants with Abraham, or the Jews, to find a ground for Infant Baptism. I was never better prepared to discuss the covenants, one and all, than now, but Eld. Ditzler has at last fully surrendered them. I close the Old Testament.”

After this mutual explanation, Dr. Graves commenced his sixth reply.]

MR. PRESIDENT:—The entire argument from the Old Testament being openly surrendered—for, independent of, and without its covenants, there could be no church, visible church; and with an invisible or ideal one, we have nothing to do—I shall, leaving the multitude of side issues, of which his last speech was made up, now open the New Testament.

NEW TESTAMENT ARGUMENT.

After wandering through the shadows of the typical dispensations for 4000 years, in vain search of an inference or analogy to support the humanly invented rite of infant baptism, we at last emerge into the glorious sunrise of the New Gospel Dispensation. We can now rise into the sun, like the symbolized church, seen by John, in Patmos, and leave the moon and the stars—all types and shadows—under our feet.

Christ tells us, not to our misleading, that "the law," *i. e.*, the Covenant at Sinai, with all its rites, etc., "and the prophets," the burden of whose song was the Messiah and his Kingdom that was to come—"were until John, since which time the Kingdom of heaven"—the true Kingdom, the true Church, of which the old Jewish Kingdom, or Commonwealth, was but a type, as Paul tells us, "is preached, and all men press into it." This is the church we have so long been in search of—"the true tabernacle which the Lord Jesus pitched, and not man. Here is where we should have commenced last Saturday morning.

We open the New Testament, and lo! and behold all old things have passed away, and all things have become new. My eye rests upon the new covenant, founded upon better promises. A new priest—the one mediator of the New Testament Covenant, who comes to offer

"A sacrifice of nobler name,
And richer blood than they"

could offer, under the old, and I meet here a new law, which constitutes a new government, a new man, which is a new church—the real and substantial, as opposed to the typical and shadowy—a kingdom and church, no longer composed of one carnal race and blood, as the typical, but of all nations and kindred, and blood, that dwell on the face of the whole earth, and yet of one race, the seed of Abraham, and of one blood, kindred each of Jesus Christ.

There was, indeed, a change of priesthood, from the family of Levi to that of Judah; from the human to the divine, from the typical to the real and the true; a change of the *sacrifices*, from the *bestial* to *divine*, from the *blood of bulls* and of goats, that availed nought to the sanctifying of the worshipper, but brought sin continually to remembrance, to the *blood of the everlasting Covenant* of Redemption—now prominently brought forward and ratified, which cleanseth from all sin. Paul tells us expressly that a change of the priesthood necessitates a change of the law. The Mosaic or Jewish Dispensation alone was purely *legal*. He that did the things commanded, was to live by them, but cursed be every one that continueth not

in all things written in the book of the law to do them. The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth by Jesus Christ. Because, of its legal character, it was faulty, it could save no one, for no one could fulfill its demands; but it had had a purpose to fulfill; it was added to the Covenant of Promise God made with Abraham, "because, of transgressions, till the seed," Christ, should come, so that the law, that whole ceremonial dispensation, the nation and its worship, was a "*païs agagos*, a guiding slave to lead us to Christ, or until Christ; i. e. until was brought in, the New Dispensation of Grace by faith.

But says the apostle, after that faith is come we are no longer under a guiding slave, for are we not all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus?—for all who were immersed into Christ did put on Christ—there is no longer Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus, and if ye be Christ's then are ye [whether Jew or Gentile, male or female, bond or free]. Abraham's seed and heirs, according to the promise, Gal. iii. 24–29 [all the spiritual blessings promised to Abraham.] Here we see the utter abolishment of the old Jewish Dispensation with the church, whether real or typical, that was originated by it, with all the ceremonial law, rights and prerogatives claimed by the Jews, and the New Dispensation and the true tabernacle and church of the living God takes its place—the only condition of entering which is faith and baptism.

I maintain therefore, against the teachings of all those who would Judaize Christianity, that with the ministry of John and Christ, the old Jewish Dispensation—even call it a church if you will, or what you please, with its constitution and laws, with all its hereditary religious privilege—was abolished; had waxed old and was ready to vanish away, that the old skins of the law were not designed to hold the new wine of the Gospel, nor was the old rotten, legal garment made by Moses, designed to be patched by the new garments of righteousness wrought out by Jesus Christ. With the covenant of the old Dispensation, with its rites, its ordinances and hereditary religious privileges, the heirs of the New Covenant, and the citizens of the new kingdom, neither parents nor children have

anything to do. If they would fain graft any part of the old upon the new, if they inevitably entangle themselves in a yoke of bondage and lose that liberty wherewith Christ has made us free.—Let me read Paul's reproof of the Judaizing teachers of his day.—Read Gal. i. 6--9 and 3. through, and chap. iv. 17 to seventh verse of v.]

The old constitution of things—the law with all its appurtenances, circumcision with all its entailed rights and privileges, birth and blood, hereditary descent, with all its fancied claims upon the visible church of Christ under the New Covenant and its New Dispensation, and the ordinances of the Christian church are forever blasted and belted by the keen ax of individuality and personal responsibility so vigorously used upon them when they were so confidently brought forward and urged by the scribes and Pharisees who came and demanded the baptism of the New Dispensation for themselves and their children doubtless also, at the hands of the Harbinger.

Hear his stunning words and let all those Judaized Christians of this day who plead for the baptism of their infants—by nature an impure race—upon their fancied connection with Abraham and his covenant, read Matt. iii. 7--13.

"7. But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his baptism, he said unto them, O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?

8. Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance:

9. And think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to *our* father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.

10. And now also the ax is laid unto the root of the trees: therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.

11. I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and *with* fire:

12. Whose fan *is* in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.

“Wrath to come”—do you hear that? Do you say that those exposed to the wrath to come are INNOCENT, morally fit for heaven or the Church of Christ? Now hear the prayer Eld. Ditzler uses when he is about to sprinkle one of his “*innocent*” babes

“Almighty and everlasting God, we beseech thee for thine infinite mercies, that thou wilt look upon *this child* : wash *him* and sanctify *him* with the Holy Ghost ; that *he*, being delivered from thy wrath, may be received into the ark of Christ’s Church.”

This by way of parenthesis.

Here is the gospel of the new kingdom. Here are tersely and clearly set forth the only conditions for the most eminent and holy of Abraham’s seed to enter the kingdom, or secure its initiatory rite—the very least of its gracious privileges. The priesthood being changed there must of necessity be a change of *law*. Why do our States have conventions but to change their Constitutions, and where there is a change of the Constitution is there not, of necessity, a change of the law? Tell me, ye who desire to be under the Jewish Dispensation, were the Constitution of the State changed, would you look into the *old* or the *new* for the law, or the principles upon which future laws are to be made? Had your father died leaving two testaments or wills which would you claim under? So I ask you as Christians, for all you are to believe for salvation, and for all you are to practice for the obedience of faith, are you to look back into the Old Testament—the Old Constitution—the Old Jewish Dispensation which was only typical of the *new*, will you look to the ignorant slave boy whose office was to lead to the school house and the teacher, or will you open the New Constitution—the New Testament—the New Will, and be governed entirely by its laws and requirements? They may zealously affect you who would turn you back to the *Law*, but it is not in a good cause.

Why do you cling to the old abolished and superseded law, to learn your duty under the new covenant of Grace? Why not accept the better hope it introduced, for there is *verily* a disannulling of the covenant going before, for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof. For the law made noth-

ing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did “by which we draw nigh unto God.”—Heb. vii, 10.

Here is the new covenant whose dispensation John announced and introduced, and upon which the visible church is constituted. Read Hebrews vii, 7–9, as follows :

7. “For if that first *covenant* had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second.

8. “For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah :

9. “Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord.”

To its glorious privileges and company we are come. Hear Paul. Heb. xii. 22–26.

The most prominent members of the old church, their religious teachers, demand the baptism of the new church on the ground that they are the children of Abraham—Simeon, nor Anna, nor Mary, nor Elizabeth, nor Zachariah became members of the Church of Christ without baptism.

How does John meet them? Does he tell them they are already members in good standing; that his baptism is but a substitute for circumcision or proselyte baptism, and they, therefore, do not need his, but only accept Christ and all is well? Would he receive Nicodemus, a truly pious, honest man and a noted Rabbi and member of the Sanhedrim? No, none of this. He demanded of one and all, *personal repentance* towards God and faith in the Messiah, as a condition of baptism, and they must give him the proper evidences, proofs of their repentance.

The question can be decided right here as we stand with our foot upon the threshold of the new dispensation, and witness John under his divine commission, preparing the material for the new spiritual house, which Christ the son of David came to build, under the covenant that God had made with David, saying: “Thy son, who shall come after thee, he shall build the house of thy Kingdom.”

John the Baptist was sent to make ready a people pre-

pared for the Lord. The change required was to be a change in *them*, as well as a change of ordinances. But if those who were made ready by John were initiated by baptism into the Jewish church, his baptism being only a continuation of proselyte baptism, then did not they enter *that* church by two initiatory rites—circumcision and baptism? If they were initiated into the Christian church by his baptism, then was not his baptism a Christian rite? If they were initiated by John's baptism, into neither the Jewish nor the Christian church, were they ever members of the Christian church? If so, by *whom*, *when*, and by what rite did they enter it?

I most respectfully request Elder Ditzler to give his especial attention to the above questions. I call upon you either to answer them, or to confess that you cannot answer them and save infant baptism. The eyes of thousands of Methodists and tens of thousands of Baptists are now directed towards you. You have elicited this discussion; you have lately issued a book in which you declare the question of infant membership is vital to the very existence of the church. Certainly you will confront the above questions promptly and fairly. If you fail to do so; if you plead some frivolous excuse, the unanimous verdict of all candid Christians will be, that you feel yourself unequal to the task.

I am bound to admit that the most learned and candid portion of your scholars, repudiate the idea of church identity, and frankly admit that John, in all probability, baptized no infants.

The Rev. Dr. Hodge, Professor in Princeton Theological Seminary, who is one of the firmest upholders and defenders of Presbyterianism (O. S.) in America, takes Baptist ground, in the Princeton Review (Oct. '52), respecting the Abrahamic Covenant and the relation of the church to the world:

"When Christ came, the commonwealth was abolished, and there was nothing put in its place. The Church remained. There was no external covenant, nor promises of external blessings, on condition of external rites and subjection. There was a spiritual society, with spiritual promises, on the condition of faith in Christ. In no part of the New Testament, is any other condition of membership in the Church prescribed than that contained in the answer of Philip to the eunuch who desired

baptism: "If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.' The Church, therefore, is, in its essential nature, *a company of believers*; and not an external society, requiring merely external profession as the condition of membership."

S. T. COLERIDGE, the admirable scholar, and England's greatest thinker, bears this testimony:

"Had baptism of infants at that early period of the Gospel been a known practice, or had this been previously demonstrated, then, indeed, the argument that in all probability there was one or more infants or young children in so large a family, would be no otherwise objectionable than as being superfluous, and a sort of anti-climax in logic. But if the words are cited as *the* proof, it would be a clear *petitio principii*; though there had been nothing else against it. Equally vain is the pretended analogy from circumcision, which is no sacrament at all, but the means and mark of national distinction."

MOSES STUART—the great American scholar and Commentator, expressly declares on the Old Testament, chap. 22)—"How unwary, too, are many excellent men, in contending for infant baptism, on the ground of the Jewish analogy of circumcision! Are females not proper subjects of baptism? And again, are a man's slaves to be all baptized because he is? Are they church-members of course, when they are so baptized? Is there no difference between engrafting into a politico-ecclesiastical community and into one of which it is said, that it is not of this world? In short, numberless difficulties present themselves in our way, as soon as we begin to argue in such a manner as this."

"The covenant of circumcision affords" [this means church identity], "no ground for infant baptism."—Quoted from Jowett.

VENEMA (see *Pæd. Exam.* v. 2, p. 468.)—"Circumcision was a seal of the righteousness of faith, as the apostle affirms; but this only in respect of such Israelites as were believers."

CHARNOCK (v. 2, p. 781.)—"God seals no more than he promises. He promises only to faith, and therefore, only seals to faith. Covenant graces therefore, must be possessed and acted, before covenant blessings be ratified to us."

AUGUSTI, (7, p. 329.)—"The parallel between circumcision and baptism is altogether foreign to the New Testament."

PROF. LANGE, speaking on this point, says, this comparison is without foundation, because "the only circumcision of the gospel dispensation, is, according to Paul, that of the heart."

PAULUS, in his Commentary.—"The parallel of circumcision with baptism is inapposite; for by circumcision, one was received into the nation as such, not to a religious faith."

MR. MARSHALL.—"Both John's and Christ's disciples and apostles did *teach* before they baptized, because then no others were capable of baptism."—Quoted from Booth. p. 303.

DR. WALL.—“There is no express mention, indeed, of any children baptized by him, i. e., John.”—Introduction, p. 27.

MR. BURKITT.—John’s baptism was the baptism of repentance, of which infants are incapable.”—See Commentary on Matt. xix. 13–15.

MR. THOS. SCOTT.—“It does not appear that any but adults were baptized by John.”—See Commentary on Matt. iii. 5–6.

J. G. MANLY.—(Pedobaptist).—“Judaism had no church, either national or otherwise.” “The stereotyped verbiage and transcriptive absurdity of justifying national churchism by Judaism, should at once and forever cease.” “No one that understands the relation of Christianity to Judaism, can suppose for a moment that the former is, or ought to be, modeled after the latter. The better is not moulded by the less. The superior and permanent is not copied from the inferior and abrogated. Day is not the imitation of moonlight. Antitypes do not take their shape and hue from types. If Judaism is to be our model, we ought to *abolish the church*, and make the nation everything.”—Eccle., pp. 222, 223.

MR. PAYNE, on evidences of the popish mass, says, “I come now to the New Testament, where, if there be any proofs of the sacrifices of the mass, it is more likely to find them than in the Old; yet they produce twice as many more, such as they are, out of that than this, and, like some other persons, are more beholden to *dark types* and *obscure prophecies of the Old Testament* to make out their principles, than to the clear light of the gospel, and to any plain places in the New; and yet, if any such doctrine as this were to be received by Christians, and if any such wonderful and essential part of worship were appointed by Christ, or taught and practised by the apostles, we should surely have it more plainly set down in the New Testament than they were able to shew it.”—Pres. ag. Po., p. 64.

MR. GEE teaches that a defence of papal superstitions is, that our “worship must be of the same nature and kind with the Jewish worship, because it was to succeed it.”

So says Eld. Ditzler. Their children were in the church and ours must be.

B. H. Cooper’s words are as applicable to infant baptism as to religious establishments. He says:

“It is in vain, therefore, to cite the precedent of the Jewish theocracy in defence of religious establishments; and to whine out the complaint that to antiquate this precedent is to rob a Christian king of his only chart of duty which might direct him in his capacity of a sovereign.”—Free Ch., etc., pp. 63, 64.

DR. J. STACEY.—(Methodist).—“Baptism and the Lord’s Supper were not Jewish, but Christian—not a brief continuation of the past, but a regulative commencement of the future. They were not observed as modified rites of an old, but as distinguished signs of a new dispensation.”—The Sac., p. 272.

J. A. JAMES.—“As to the argument which is founded upon the Constitution of the Jewish Theocracy, we consider it so irrelevant and inapplicable, that the very attempt to bring it forward in support of a Christian institute, betrays at once the weakness of the cause.”—*On. Diss.*, p. 10.

BISHOP SHERLOCK.—“I will never admit of a mere consequence to prove an institution, which must be delivered in plain terms, as all laws ought to be.”—*Prs. ag. Po.*, vol. ii. App., p. 23.

DR. J. STOUGHTON.—“A Christian church, in some of its most essential points, was, after all, a perfectly new institute, in immeasurable advance of anything which the Jews before had witnessed, or been taught to conceive.”—*Ages of Chris.*, p. 37.

Also in *Ecclesia* he says :

“The Jewish church was in certain respects, and those the most characteristic and striking, so utterly different from the churches instituted by the Apostles, that a combination of the principles of the first, with the principles of the second, is simply impossible. New Testament *precedents* may be set aside for the sake of adopting Old Testament *examples*;—the system pursued by the early Christians may be exchanged for the system practised by the House of Israel; but the one can never be modified by the other. It is a question not of modification, but of revolution; as we see at once when we compare the principal features of the one, with what were the prominent marks of the other”—(p. 20). Again (p. 22), “Can the ecclesiastical constitution of Judaism be harmoniously incorporated with the Apostolic institutions of Christianity? The true answer is unquestionably in the negative.”

ROBINSON—in *Lexicon of New Testament*.—*John baptized a baptism of repentance*, i. e., by which THOSE WHO RECEIVED IT ACKNOWLEDGED THE DUTY OF REPENTANCE.”

An infant of course could not do this.

The above scholars, we repeat, are and were as devoted to the interests of infant baptism as yourself or any other man, and it is not supposable that they would so frankly and explicitly repudiate the argument drawn from the identity of the Churches—the Covenants of Circumcision and Grace, or deny that John baptized the infant children of believers, could they have discovered the least ground whatever for an opposite belief. I shall regard these three points as settled, until you refute them, i. e. :

1. The Christian Church is not a continuation of the Jewish commonwealth or church.

2. That baptism did not come in the room of circumcision.

3. That John baptized no infants.

Those who received the teachings of John, or Christ, were

far from dictating to them how things must, or must not be, ought or ought not be, or the people would become infidel.

But has it never occurred to you that the Pharisees and lawyers did reject the baptism of John, for the identical reason that pedobaptists now reject it—because he would not receive them as the children of believing parents, but repudiated all their claims and rights based upon the old Abrahamic Covenant or Church? For this very reason Pedobaptists reject the doctrines of baptism held by Baptists! What food for reflection!

Because John did not acknowledge the identity of their Covenants, churches, and rites, the Jews rejected the counsel of God against themselves, by refusing his baptism! And do not Pedobaptists reject our doctrines and baptism for the same reason? and do *they* not also reject the counsel of God because it is of God's appointment and command? and is it not against themselves?

I pray God every Pedobaptist Christian who hears me this day, may be influenced to reflect.

Refutation.

ARG. XX. If teaching, so as to secure repentance and faith is required, by Christ *before* baptism—as the most learned and candid of Pedobaptists themselves admit, then to baptize before teaching, repentance and faith is to alter and pervert the Word of God, which is to incur the displeasure of God and endanger the salvation of men.

But all those who practice Infant Baptism, do baptize before they secure repentance and faith by teaching.

Ergo.—They do pervert the Word of God and endanger the salvation of men.

ARG. XXI. If men were not to presume to alter anything however minute in rites or ceremonies under the law, neither to add to, nor take from them, without incurring the displeasure of God, and if He is as strict and jealous of his worship under the gospel, then men cannot alter by adding to the ordinances, under the gospel, without incurring the anger and displeasure of God.

That this is the case read Rev. xxii. 18. But Infant Baptism was never instituted by express command or example, or promise, as all candid Pedobaptists admit; therefore, to practice it as a religious rite, and in the name of Christ, is to alter, by adding to His words.

Ergo. We are bound to conclude that those who do so, incur the anger

and judgments of God—the plague of the book will be added to those who do it willingly, or wilfully, or ignorantly, if they have and can read His Word.

ARG. XXII. If there be but one baptism of water, left by Jesus Christ in the New Testament, and but one condition or manner of right thereto, and that one baptism is that of an adult, and that one condition faith, then to teach and practice two baptisms, one of unconscious infants, and one of adults, and to make two conditions, one of faith and one without faith, is knowingly to alter and pervert, by adding to, the plain law of Christ, and can but be impiety and sin in the sight of God.

But there is but *one* baptism of water left by Christ in the New Testament, and but one condition or manner of right thereto and that one baptism is that of an adult, as Richard Baxter and others are free to admit. He says, “The way of the Lord is *one*. One Lord, one faith, one baptism; and faith and repentance is the condition of the adult, and AS TO ANY OTHER CONDITION, I AM SURE THE SCRIPTURE IS SILENT.” And we know, if we have honesty enough to admit that wherever the Scripture specifies any one character or condition it prohibits every other.

ERGO.—Those who practice Infant Baptism do make two baptisms, one of adults and one of infants, also two conditions to it, one of faith and one without faith, contravening the command of God, and do thus knowingly alter and add to the Word which is a sin in the sight of God.

DR. DITZLER'S SEVENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS :—The Doctor quotes Acts ii. 47—only “the saved” added. Of course, only the *saved* were “added,” forso, Carson and A. Campbell all agree that *infants* were *born* members. So it was not necessary to add them. Moreover, where, as on Pentecost it was an occasion of great uproar and sinners cut to the heart, their conversion is there the point presented. Were their infants lost in sin—unsaved?

Dr. Graves, to save himself, urges that John “preached the Gospel of the kingdom.” That shows it was what he represented. Paul tells us as well as Isaiah, “the Gospel was preached to Abraham,” Gal. iii, 8, and in the wilderness, Heb. x. 1, 2, as well as in Isaiah’s day, Rom. ix. 15, “the Gospel of peace,” quoted from Isaiah. So down he comes again.

He says there is no institution without government, ordinances, etc. True, but they had so many, and so much government, “the law of commandments contained in ordinances” was taken out of the way. They had just a little too much of that kind of thing, instead of being defective. “All things are become new.” That only refers to individual experience, as he knows—“a new creation in Christ Jesus.” Is it by such phrases he would destroy what God would not destroy and disparage God’s holy word?

He urges that there was a new law, a new man, a new church. In all ages a new heart was familiar as the Prophets and David show him. But it was the same old church. New converts did not make a new church. They “were added.”

Again, let us glance over the facts to avoid confusion through the constant quibbling of our opponent. In Moses’ day all the ceremonies and ordinances came gradually into use. At Sinai the law of them was given. But changes had been going on since they left Egypt. During the prophetic days David and Solomon, as well as conquests later, introduced vast

changes in the outward affairs and economy of the church. Yet no one contends that any or all of these made it another church organization. If then "the bringing in" "of all these externals did not (1), destroy the church, and (2) organize a new one, (3), on radically different principles, why will the taking of them "out of the way" do so?' Is not that plain? The ritualistic law of ordinances given at Sinai "waxed old," "made nothing perfect," "was added because of transgression" "till the time of reformation"—a mere shadow of things to come were all its sacrifices—all pointed to Christ. Now trace Christ through his ministry. He came in the flesh. John preached, pointed to Christ. The Messiah appears—preaches between three and four years. After a while, Matt. x., he sends out his Twelve to preach. Later he sends seventy more. We are not to presume their labor was void of good results. Numbers are led to believe. Christ found Simeon, Anna, Elizabeth, Zachariah, the Marys, the Twelve, the seventy either full of faith and the Spirit, or, as some of them were, ready at once to receive him. Gradually he reforms the Jews. He is the separating power. Thus he goes on for nearly four years, reforming the Jews. But where did he organize a church? Where did he build up and establish any separate congregations, officer them, and leave a preacher in charge, or they call one? Nothing of the kind takes place anywhere. So he closes his ministry on the cross. No distinct church and code of separate laws given, but a series of beautiful lessons years afterwards reduced to written forms by his followers, who were eye witnesses of his majesty. Where is the new or separate church? Now, for so important a matter WE DEMAND THE RECORD. Even human rights are not treated as you propose to treat these tremendous issues. *We go by the record:* We propose no guessing. A fuss, a hurrah, a lot of smoke and dust cast into people's eyes do not give *records* and *dates* and *FACTS*. God's economy is on trial in this matter before the people, and great questions of church rights and privileges. Not only are these the records, but we are supported by all the facts in all great reforms both (1) by God himself and (2) under His providence by those of great men, such as Moses,

Habakkuk, Nehemiah, Paul, Luther, Calvin, Wesley All such reforms are gradual—the changes are gradual—the transition regular.

Christ is crucified. He rises and communicates with the apostles and believers now for forty days. No new church yet, no separate organization of congregations. His apostles were told to tarry in Jerusalem till the Spirit came upon them. They elect one in Judas' place, is as much a church act as any act of their lives. Pentecost finds. (1) the Twelve, (2) the hundred, and (3) the great multitude of the pious ones. Acts ii. 5–11, and directly three thousand scoffers are converted—added—and “daily the Lord adds to the church the saved.”

These apostles, one hundred, twenty, and the multitude of devout Jews there who received the Spirit, were members of God's church already. If not, when did they become so? Was water baptism necessary to it? (1) Not a word has been adduced to prove it. (2) There is no record of proof on earth where either one of the Twelve, the one hundred twenty, or the crowd of devout Jews there was ever baptized by John, or by command from Christ. All the proofs point the other way, as it is in evidence that a question arose between those baptized by John and Jesus, Matt. ix. 14. After Pentecost the apostles preach on, frequent the Temple, the synagogue, as well as teach in private houses. It is only in Paul's journeys and labors among Gentiles, that households, churches in houses, occur. This is long years after Pentecost. Such now is the plain record. Your new church nowhere appears. John and Peter follow Philip to Samaria—Acts viii. 9.

No, no—there is no record—no proof, and in no court on earth could a verdict be secured in favor of one litigant against another where human rights were involved, on the kind of evidence wholly relied on by my opponent. No man on earth would go into a court with that kind of evidence. Because it is religion, a church question, are we to utterly ignore all the rules and laws of evidence—all the facts and records of Bible, history, and go on a wild career of speculation, without a record of facts, a single truth to support us?

The doctor said, [he may not have spoken what he intended]

“a change of the priesthood changes the priesthood.” Does he mean that a change of the *law* of the priesthood changes the priesthood? or that a change of the priesthood changes the law of the priesthood? Heb. vii. 12. But what has that to do with organizing a new church? (1) The coming in of the priests and (2) the coming in of the law regulating them, which was through weeks or months of time—gradual—did not make a new church. Try again, Doctor.

Do you not see that he, like all his predecessors, has to rely on mere special pleading, taking for granted the very thing under controversy all the way through?

Let me call your attention to another fact. If the Jews were jealous of anything on earth, it was their rights in the church. They sought every opportunity possible to entrap Jesus and the apostles. They even accused them of speaking against the Temple, because he predicted its fall. Paul was repeatedly arrested, tried in open court, and they brought all the charges they could against him. See Acts xxii. 1–19, xxiii. 6–10; xxv. 8; xxvi. 2–26. He answered touching all the things whereof he was accused of the Jews. Yet they never charged him or his people with claiming the subversion of the old church, nor the organization of a new one, nor indeed the rejection of infants from it. Had the apostles rejected infants it would have given the Jews a special case of stirring up all possible hate against them on that point.

But the Doctor thinks it is Ditzler against the Discipline. Not at all. Our creed is in the articles of religion. The Ritual is not the creed. It is left to our use or not. Methodists mean what they say when they teach liberty of conscience. That form of the Ritual was not in the earlier Disciplines anywhere. Wesley never wrote one word of *that* part.

As to the church, Paul is pointed, Heb. xii, 22, 24. Having catalogued the representative men of the church in all ages (ch. xi, entire) that their numbers were not completed, they were witnesses to the saving efficacy, and power of faith in Christ, Jesus being “the founder, beginner, and finisher of the faith”—so the Greek reads, treated of from ch. x, 38, 39, through ch. xi; all in Paul’s day are encouraged to look

to him as the only Savior, and not to ritualistic services; for, the law of ritualistic services at Sinai being "removed"—you do not approach God by Sinai—ye are not come to the mount, etc., verses 18–21—all is terror there—"but ye are come to Mount Zion, to the General Assembly and church of *the first born*"—ye unite with this grand army, cloud of witnesses," to the fact that it is through faith and not ordinances that we are saved. You thus come to the great body of God's people, one in all ages, in all times, and in all lands, "to Jesus," who was "the beginner and the finisher of the faith," by which all are saved, for there is "one Lord, one faith," and one baptism. We all walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, "who saw [by faith] Christ's day and was glad." Such is the beauty and harmony of apostolic preaching, alike consistent and honoring to God.

The Doctor comes along with some more syllogisms. They are on a par with the rest. Look at a sample—the first that I caught.

Any act that forestalls all future intelligent action of the child is wrong. Infant Baptism does forestall it. Therefore it is wrong. Let us look at this precious specimen of *logic*. (?)

1. It assumes that baptizing a child forestalls future intelligent action. That, we deny. It is a point to be proved. It is not true by any means.

2. It assumes that to forestall future intelligent action is wrong. This is untrue. Educating a child that is under your authority is forestalling its choice in education. Much you teach it may be regarded by it as of little or no value—nay hurtful.

3. Circumcising an infant forestalled future intelligent action as much so, and far more, than does baptism, even from your stand-point.

4. A Baptist child at 9, 10, 12, 16 years old, as a rule, exercises no more intelligence of choice in the church it joins, and mode of baptism it undergoes, than a babe six months old. It is as free from investigation, has as little show for "choice"

from any intelligent stand-point, as a babe. The same is true of most children of all churches.

5. It is a Bible question, to be settled by that record.

Here is another syllogism. "Now hear me, Hal." "All that is necessary to *faith* and *practice* is in the New Testament. Infant Baptism is not there, not in the commission. Therefore it is not necessary to our faith and practice." Here he assumes that everything that is not expressly named is not in the New Testament. We all know that is utterly untrue. It assumes that all the apostolic churches had all the Scriptures of the New Testament from five to sixty years *before they were written!!* Poor logic! It calls in question—or rather ignores Luke's and Paul's testimony. The one tells us that the Bereans were more noble than those of Thessalonica in that they searched the Scriptures daily to see if these things were so." These were the Old Testament Scriptures, for the New was not then in existence, 2 Tim. iii, 15–17 Timothy from a child knew the Holy Scriptures, which were the Old Testament, as not a word of the New was written when he was a child. Yet says Paul of the Old Testament, it "is good for doctrines, for instruction in righteousness," etc., etc., "that the man of God may be thoroughly perfect," etc. Now *we* could frame a host of syllogisms on this wise: All churches that reject the Old Testament, aid infidelity. Baptists do so. Hence, they aid infidelity. All churches that ignore the teachings and true use of the Old Testament, violate Paul's teaching, and apostolic precedent. Baptists do so, hence, etc.

But we regard all this talk about forms of logic in utter absence of a single logical argument as simply ridiculous. If all that is necessary to faith and practice is there, why do you ever use the old. If all is there, why this parade of Lexicons, commentators, critics,—Catholics, Jews, classics—all creation raked up on mode of baptism? All that is essential to faith and practice may be in the New Testament or even in one single epistle—contain more than some of us live up to. But to understand it all—comprehend it all, all of us have to go to that of which the other is a continuance and enlargement. By the words of the commission alone who could understand it, but

for the practices and principles and history of the parties involved? Water is not named in the commission. Why not baptize with wine, classically as Plato uses it? Why not with abuse as Alcibiades uses it? It does not say a word about water—with water. Again—what are you going to teach them? Teach them all things whatsoever I have commanded you? Did he command to organize a new church, legislate infants out; and regard this as what was meant by receiving such little ones in my name? Clearly enough the commission has to be interpreted in the light of existing facts—practices. Always among the Jews infant children were taken in with their parents. This none will deny. In discipling adults from Gentiles, in all cases their infants came in with them. They knew nothing else. Hence, no class is specified in the commission. There was no need of it whatever. Baptizing them—whom? It does not specify (1) men, (2) nor women, (3) nor boys, (4) nor girls—(5) nor children. It is the commission of one who acts on the plain principles of common-sense and common honesty. As they had been taught for over three years that the great first task was reforming, elevating, arousing the membership of the church, so now, having a goodly start, the purified, purged church, bring into it the Gentiles. All are now to be held as on a common level—one new man or element. For over three years we have taught Jews—all have had a chance—all rejecting me are now declared ex-communicate—the veil is rent—all are now to come in alike—Jew and Gentile.

Now, Dr. A. Campbell truly tells us that during the whole of the Apostolic age infant circumcision was practiced. We learn as much, Acts xv. 1-21, and xxi.

Now this being so—

1. It was a recognition of the fact that the old church of God was not destroyed, but continued.

2. That infants were still recognized as members of the church. There is no way of evading the force of these facts. How could the Apostolic church still continue to circumcise all their male infants as had been the case, during the first century till near its close at least, yet regard their infants as no part of the church?

We have now met all on earth the Doctor has named. We have swept it all away as chaff before the wind. What next will he get up? Evidently nothing better; for we are now late in the third day on this question. My points are established—fixed. Not a stake has he shaken—not a cord has he broken, not a stone has he jostled. Look now at our position. We started out showing there was a church long centuries before Christ came in the flesh. We then analyzed the whole question of church existence and machinery. We showed it was the effect of the espousal of great truths—embracing Christ in faith in which act men were saved. As faith in God is the great stay of heart and life, it is all important to have the same developed in infancy—faith and love of truth God gave man the promise of redemption—Christ was the means---the pledge and ratifier of the covenant of salvation.

All who had sinned and done wickedly could be restored by embracing the promise of this Covenant, Jesus Christ, by faith. Such parties are most naturally drawn into sympathy and co-operation for the good of their common kind. All who embraced the Promised Seed were God's spiritual family—church—"called" from sin and death to purity. But they had to undergo all this to become as innocent before God and morally fit for heaven as infants, through the Covenant of Redemption, were without those processes. As faith transforms the soul, they are taught to believe in God, and as they grow up take hold upon God, and are morally developed into His moral image in the active virtues and sanctifying powers of religion. They are his church, wherever any number of these believers choose they meet, organize themselves together—there is a church visible. Such organized form is seen in Moses' day. They worship—have officers in the church as we have now. They have synagogues and temple where they meet, sing, praise, read, hear God's word, pray.

We examined into the church visible and invisible. All was found intact. They had rules for expulsion of members and ministers and enforced them well at times, laxly at times, just as we now do. Bad men got in then, do so now. Good men deplored those evils then, as *often* you read in the Prophets—so they do now

Infants were recognized as in that church always. It was God's economy. Christ came—found that state of things—he never put the infants out. To a people who had always had infants in the church, which in his day and for centuries before, was often called the kingdom of God—to a people whose infants were always in the church, Christ said of little children brought in the arms of their mothers—called by Luke “infants”—“of such is the kingdom of heaven.” “He that receiveth one such little one in my name receiveth me.” Does that look like rejecting them—putting them out?

We will, in our next speech, take up the history of Infant Baptism after the Apostolic age, and hear the testimony of the fathers of the earlier ages of the church, after Apostolic history ceases.

Now, again, we demand chapter and verse just as *we* give. We have relied on no inference, however just, as to (1) the Church; (2) infants in it; (3) their receiving the appropriate ordinances of the church. We gave chapter and verse for *all*—for every point. You say (1) that Church ceased, (2) a new one was organized, (3) on radically different principles, (4) legislating infants out. Give us plain, emphatic “thus saith the Lord” for all of that. Surely if it is so important to make it plain, undoubted that they were in—as you all agree—in so poor a church as you make out the one God had for 4000 years, the rejection of them from so pure and admirable a church will be named. Give us chapter and verse.—[*Time out.*

DR. GRAVES' SEVENTH REPLY.

MR. PRESIDENT.—I come now to examine the character of material John prepared for the Lord—for of like material the entire building is to be composed.

1. DID JOHN BAPTIZE UNBELIEVERS AND INFANTS—OR BELIEVERS ONLY?

Notice the characters he addressed. They were all church members—according to your teachings—for they were all circumcised, and members of the Jewish commonwealth, which you call a church, unless you will surrender your church identity theory with the covenants, and you must for without the covenants of the Old Testament you cannot get a foundation for anything to call a church—you ought to give it up in very *word* as you did the covenants.

But what you denominate the Jewish church, was a *politico-religious* organization, of which all the natural descendants of Abraham, together with the slaves purchased by them, were members by virtue of such relationship and purchase. Of this “church,” idolaters among the Jews, every vile and abominable character, the murderers of the prophets and of the Son of God, as well as David and Samuel, Anna and Simeon, were legal members. This is what the old ‘church’ was. Was it what Christ evidently designed the “new man,” or church to be?

What is the nature of religion under the New Testament? Is it not *elective*? Is it not a matter of *personal, voluntary* choice? Does it not require a *conscious, voluntary* obedience to every requirement? Is not every command of Christ addressed to the individual directly? Must he not understand it, and obey or disobey it? Is not every duty it enjoins a *personal* duty, which the individual must discharge himself; and which cannot be discharged for him by another—much less when he is unconscious of the duty? If the Romish priest may not per-

form penance for the unconscious dead, no more may the Protestant perform baptism or any other religious duty for the unconscious infant. But to be baptized and to unite one's self to the Christian church are religious duties, and are therefore addressed to Christians and to the individual. Religion, therefore, being elective and purely a personal matter between the individual and Christ, and not between Christ and the parent and priest for the child, and requiring as it does, in every instance, a *conscious, voluntary* obedience, we are driven to the conclusion that the baptism and church membership of unconscious infants form no part of the religion of Christ, and we may expect to find his churches composed of professed believers only. While on the other hand, if baptism and church membership, are hereditary and national, we may look for national churches—like the Jewish—embracing atheists, infidels, idolaters and murderers in its world-wide comprehensiveness.

Mark the preaching of John.

The first sentence that fell from his lips transformed religion from a *national* and proxorial, to an individual and elective affair, and thus abolished Judaism from thenceforth. "Repent ye," said the Harbinger, not *nationally* but *personally*, each one of you for himself, for the *kingdom of heaven*, not a Jewish kingdom, but something *different* and *distinct* from that—a new dispensation, the Messianic kingdom is at hand. This command was laid upon *all* who were to become members of the new kingdom.

Now comes the decisive test. The Pharisees and Sadducees (as Elder Ditzler would have done) came and demanded baptism at his hands, under the impression that John's baptism belonged to the legal dispensation or old Abrahamic church and being included in that, they claimed his baptism, not by virtue of *repentance*, but by their relation to Abraham and his Covenant, and the *old Church*—the very reasons the advocates for infant baptism urge for their practice now. We see, then, that this great question, which now convulses the church, was clearly presented by the Jews, and as clearly decided by John. The issue was, "Did John's ministry belong to the

old dispensation, and was baptism but a substitute for circumcision? If so, then every Jew, *man, and male* infant, (and no others) had an undoubted right to it, and John did wrong to forbid their rightful reception of his baptism, and thus repudiate their just claims and title. But he did most positively deny the identity of his mission with the old Jewish economy, and taught that he came a Harbinger of a new order of things—Messiah's kingdom—in which relationship to believing parents, though that parent were Abraham himself, gave no right or title to his baptism; and he distinctly taught them the new kingdom he came to usher in, was radically distinct from the old. Hear his address, as I can well imagine it:

"You urge in vain your relationship to Abraham. This relationship does not one whit improve your *moral* nature. God can transform these stones around me, into beings, with as holy natures as Abraham's blood descendants. You mistake the nature of the kingdom I come to introduce. It is not a *national* Church like the Jewish Israel, that Messiah comes to establish, and set up but a spiritual kingdom, composed of spiritual and holy persons only. Under the old order, the many wicked and ungodly were found with the few righteous and obscured their light, the barren and ill-bearing trees cumbered the ground and shaded out the good trees: but Messiah will not allow this in his kingdom—he will lay the ax unto the roots of all the trees without favor or distinction, and the trees bearing good fruit alone will be allowed to stand, while all others will be rejected. He will thus make his true people evident to the world."

"He will not allow his floor to be unpurged—the chaff mingled with the wheat—but comes to purge it thoroughly, and the wheat alone will be gathered into his garner—that the prophecy of David (Ps. 1) may be fulfilled, that "sinners shall not stand in the *congregation* of the righteous." Before you can claim *my* baptism, or share in the blessings of this kingdom, to which my preaching and baptism are prerequisite, *you must repent*, each one of you, and give me good evidence of your repentance, and then you may receive at my hand the *baptism of repentance*."

Such, in brief, was the teaching of John. He denied the alleged connection between the two churches and dispensations, that a right to the former, conferred any title to the latter—and *Baptists are the only people who teach the above doctrines*.

The main pillar of proof for infant baptism now, is based upon this old exploded Judaistic theory of the identity of Covenants and *churches*, and since infants were allowed to be circumcised under the old, they should be allowed to be bap-

tized under the new—unless we can show when their rights were cut off.

Well, suppose we grant that the churches are the same, but at the coming of Christ he made some changes, revised the old constitution, as all Pedobaptists admit, where are we now to look for the laws to govern his kingdom, into the new constitution, (New Testament,) or back to the old constitution? (Old Testament.) If into the New Testament, as every candid and intelligent man must admit, then the first sentence of the first law of the new constitution abolishes infant rights, John's *pruning ax* cuts them off forever—unless *Elder Ditzler can find some subsequent SPECIAL provision* in their favor. This we have called upon him in vain to do. Why can he not find it?

We are told that Jewish parents would have been shocked at the idea of leaving their infants out. Perhaps so; perhaps they were, and perhaps this was the very reason why they so universally rejected Christ. He came to set up a spiritual church, not a national one, and he required personal religion of all who entered it. Moses, and all the Prophets, had taught them that at the coming of Messiah a radical and complete change of things would be introduced, that old things were to pass away and all things to become new—and a new Covenant would be made, unlike the old, &c. (See Jer. xxxi. 30-33)

2. BUT IT IS CERTAIN THAT JOHN BAPTIZED NO INFANTS.

We have the charity to presume that no one will dare charge John with teaching one thing and practicing contrary to it. If he did not practice contrary to his teaching, he certainly baptized no *unconscious infants*, since not *one* condition laid down by him could be met by infants, and *he made no exceptions*, and gave no warrant for *proxy obedience*. Infants could not hear or obey his message—and his message and mission were only to such as could *hear* and *obey*. They could not repent, or believe on a coming Messiah. Nor can you say that John did not interfere with their previous existing rights under the old Covenant, which were recognized in the new: for we have shown that he cut them off, and taught most em-

phatically that the old "church" with its parental relationship, gave them no right or title to his baptism.

Here we stand upon firm and impregnable ground, and look from the first sermon of John to the first sermon of Christ, and see that the "people prepared" by him must have been all professed believers.

John preached saying, "*repent ye,*" and required of them the proper evidences of their penitence. Those who furnished these evidences, and those *alone*, were baptized of him in Jordan, "confessing their sins."

He rejected the Pharisees and lawyers, who did not give genuine evidence of repentance.

Mark's testimony is: "John did baptize in the wilderness and preach the baptism of *repentance* [mark, not the baptism of *remission* but of *repentance*] for the remission of sins, (making repentance the condition of the remission of sins, and not baptism), and they were all [*i. e.* who did repent] baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins.

Paul says, Acts xix, 4: "John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him who should come after him, *i. e.* on Christ." They were then all *professed believers*. Not one particle of evidence can be wrested, by rack or torture, from the Sacred Record, to show that John baptized any but those giving evidence of repentance and professing faith in Christ. *He was not a Pedobaptist.*

3. John baptized in every case upon a *profession or declaration on the part of the believer of his repentance, and remission of sins past; and Baptist ministers alone resemble him in this particular.*

Pedobaptists cannot baptize for this purpose, or how can they baptize infants? The act of John's baptism was not to change the *moral character* of the subject, nor was it the *procuring or instrumental cause of remission of sins*, as we understand Mr. Wesley. Was it not to secure this peculiar purification and moral fitness, which they understood by the Prophets would be required of Messiah's subjects, that the Pharisees and lawyers came to his baptism, and demanded it at his hands?

They did not understand the nature of the change, but were willing and anxious to secure it. If John administered baptism *for* the remission of sins, they were the very persons to whom he should have administered it, and if a *willingness*, and even *anxiety* to be baptized, is a sufficient evidence of true repentance, as Ritualists teach, then had the Pharisees and lawyers true repentance, and John should have baptized them. But a willingness to be immersed is not sufficient evidence of true repentance and remission of sins. We find nothing in all John's teaching, or what is recorded of him, that he baptized *for* remission of sins—his was denominated the "baptism of *repentance*"—*eis*, *into* the remission of sins. This expression denotes a declaration or profession of the fact that their sins had been remitted. See baptism *eis*, into the Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit; also, *eis*, into Moses, *eis*, into Christ, *eis*, into his death, *eis*, into my name, etc. Therefore, John was no Ritualist.

Eld. Ditzler's challenge is accepted. He says, he has shown that infants were in the Jewish church or old dispensation of the church, and he calls upon Baptists to show where they were rejected from the Christian church. I will show him.

1. John rejected them from the "people" he prepared for Christ, which people Christ constituted into the first visible Christian church. When he demanded repentance of every one he baptized, he cut off infants as certainly as he did infidels.

2. When he baptized only upon the confession of sins, he cut off infants.

3. When he rejected the children of believing parents, the Jews pleaded they were the children of Abraham. John abolished all hereditary rights and privileges, and established those only belonging to *character*—the believer in Christ, and thus again he cut off infants.

Now let me ask a few questions, not quite so easy of solution, perhaps, as yours.

1. Has Christ anywhere required you to baptize the infants of professed believers, or of every family? Is there a clear example of the baptism of the infant of any one?

2. If so, why can you not find one such command or example—one passage, that you can agree among yourselves, does teach or warrant it? You have not done this!

3. But if you can find neither, why do you enjoin it as a Christian duty, and an ordinance of the Christian church? Is it not adding to the Bible?

4. Is not the ordinance (or, as you call it, the sacrament,) of Christian baptism exclusively an ordinance of the New Testament and ordained by Jesus Christ? If so, why go to the “church,” as you call it, called into existence by the covenant made with Abraham to find a law for infant baptism (sprinkling)?

5. Did not the kingdom, or any of the kingdoms, of which the great image seen by Nebuchadnezzar was the emblem, exist anterior to the cutting out of the above mentioned stone? Or does not the expression, “Thou sawest, O King, *until* a stone cut out,” etc., imply that the kingdom, or kingdoms, of which it (the image) was emblematical, did and should commence existence before “the stone” should be *actually* cut out? See and read Dan. ii. 44–46.

6. Now it is plain that the stone was cut out after the kingdoms were set up, and that it represented the Church of Christ. This true, the Christian church could not have existed anterior to the time of Daniel.

7. But had not the Abrahamic “church” been in existence, and was it not *then* in existence, at the time when Nebuchadnezzar saw the stone which was cut out without hands?

8. If the Christian dispensation is a continuation of the Jewish, baptism only coming in the room of proselyte baptism, entitling the children of believing parents to Christian privileges, with what propriety could John refuse the *Jews*, who were the children of Abraham, or the children of the Jews, any participation in his baptism?

9. If John’s baptism and the economy under which he preached and baptized, was only substituted for the Jewish, why did he require repentance and faith as a condition in *every subject* he baptized—conditions which were not known in the Jewish economy, or Abrahamic church, and which cut off,

with but *one* exception, all who were admitted into the Abrahamic church by circumcision, Abraham being the only one ever circumcised as a profession or seal of his faith?

10. Did the Jews, the members of the Abrahamic church, (as you call it) consider *their* church, and that constituted by *Jesus Christ*, as identical? If so, why their hostility to and maltreatment of the members of Christ's church?

11. If the Jewish church and the Christian church be the same church, or identical, how could John the Baptist with propriety say to the Jews, "The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand," ("has come."). How could he say "*has come*," of that which has been in existence for thousands of years?

12. If John's dispensation was neither the Jewish nor the Christian, neither the *close* of one the nor the *beginning* of the other, into what church did John initiate those whom he baptized?

13. Jesus, Messiah, said of certain Jews, "Ye shut up the Kingdom of Heaven against men, for ye neither go in yourselves, nor suffer them who are entering to go in." If this kingdom, of which the Savior spake, was the Jewish church, and identical with the Christian church, were not those Jews already in the church? And, if so, how are we to understand the above language?

14. If the Christian church is but a continuation of the Abrahamic or Jewish, why are not the *adult* children of believing parents as much entitled to baptism as infants? And how can you get in Gentiles?

Will you please answer this? Adults by thousands and without faith were circumcised, and incorporated into the "old church," why not in the new? I ask you again:

15. Is not the church or kingdom of Jesus Christ a spiritual organization, designed to be composed of the saved, Christians only, not men of this world? If the theory of Pedobaptists, in relation to infant membership, was fully, practically carried out, among all people, tongues, kindreds, and nations of earth: as in Russia, Sweden and Austria, would not the church, in less than a century from this time, become co-extensive with the Nation or State, as in several of the European States?

Would there be an individual in human form that would not be within the pale of this visible church? And then, how would the language of the Savior, "My kingdom is not of this world," longer remain true?

Then, while you would find the overwhelming mass of the population, ministers and priests, unregenerate and really unbelieving as well as unregenerate, as in those countries mentioned, yet being all baptized the law of the commission cannot be carried out, which is to disciple, *i. e.*, to make Christians first and then baptize. The law would thus be inverted, and so perverted and subverted by the theory.

My friend's reply is a very lame one, viz: If all were converted, the commission could not be carried out. This is an impossible supposition, for there are one or two depraved beings born every second—beings who cannot be addressed under the commission until *accountable* for sins, ten or fourteen years of age, and thus while the race multiplies, the Gospel must needs be preached, men disciplined, baptized etc. But Elder Ditzler puts it out of the power of every child he baptizes, so far as his church can do it, to obey Christ in baptism. He is told he was baptized in infancy, and no Pedobaptist church will permit him to render voluntary obedience to Christ and observe the order of His law

Refutation.

ARG. XXIII. Any ordinance that makes void the express command of Christ, must be a tradition of men—for men's traditions invariably make void the law of God—and are sinful.

But the baptism of all infants, as the Methodists teach, would make null the command to baptize believers.

Ergo—Infant baptism is a human tradition, and sinful in the sight of God.

ARG. XXIV. (1) Christian Baptism is, in every case, an act of intelligence and *voluntariness*.

(2). The Baptism of an unconscious infant is an act of ignorance and constraint, never of intelligence and voluntariness.

(3). *Ergo*, Infant Baptism is in no case Christian Baptism.

ARG. XXV. (1). Any religious act that is not of faith, is displeasing to God—"Without faith it is impossible to please God."

(2). Infant Baptism is a religious act that is not of faith, nor can be said to be of faith in either parent or infant, since there is no command for, or promise attached to it, or knowledge on the part of the infant.

(3). Therefore, Infant Baptism must be displeasing to God.

ARG. XXVI. (1. If Infant Baptism were an institution of Christ for some specific purpose, then Pedobaptists could not be at a loss, or would not differ about the *grounds* of the right of infants to baptism.

(2). But they are at a great loss, and they can not agree either upon what authority to desire it or the purpose for which it was given. Ergo,

Among the many reasons for baptizing an infant I notice the following :

1. It is to wash away Original Sin as Wesley and the Methodist Episcopal Church teaches. [See Doctrinal Tracts, "Wesleyana," and her Ritual.]

2. It is their right by the Abrahamic Covenant.

3. They have a right of their own faith, *superinduced*.

4. On the faith of their parents.

5. On the faith of their sureties.

6. That the Church can give them the right

7. On Apostolic tradition.

8. On the inferred authority of Scriptures.

9. On the silence of the Scriptures.

10. Because the infants of believing parents are born pure or holy—and therefore entitled to it.

11. Because they are born members of the Church, and therefore entitled to it.

12. Because Baptism is a sacrament, a Divinely appointed means of grace, and should be withheld from none, young or old. M. E. Church.

13. Because it is a seal of the Covenant of Grace, out of which no one can be saved.

14. It produces for the child, though unconscious, the regeneration of the Holy Spirit, and creates it a member of Christ, an heir of God, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven.

15. Because without it there is no certain promise to any one to enter heaven.

15. Because as Neander teaches, though the Scriptures do not enforce it, and are indeed silent about it, yet it is in accordance with the Spirit of Christianity.

(3). Therefore Infant Baptism is not an institution of Christ.

DR. DITZLER'S EIGHTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS :—In presenting the History of Infant Baptism after the death of the apostles, we quote the celebrated Tertullian first as witness, because, 1st—All truthful men agree that he names it as an existing institution in his day, and even the bitterest opponents confess it. Thus, A. Campbell, in his maturest work, *Christian Baptism*, pages 269, 355, twice in substance repeats, thus: “Tertullian, the first who mentions infant baptism,” etc. Dr. Gale, Baptist, who writes to answer Wall, says: “As to his express mention of Infant Baptism, when he opposes it, that does not necessarily argue,” etc.; Wall, xi. 345, Oxford edition, 1862, in 2 vols.

2d—Because he is claimed by all Baptists who hold to the so-called succession theory, as a Baptist. Orchard, 33; Ford, 152; Waller, Benedict, etc. “He, as a Baptist, stood,” etc.; Orchard 33.

3d—Because all parties acknowledge him to have been a scholar of great erudition, a learned lawyer, a trained rhetorician, and, all candid men admit, he was a sophist of the shrewdest kind. So Neander, vol. 1, 683, by Torrey.

4th—Because he lived so near the apostolic age. He wrote his work on baptism about A. D. 190. John, the apostle, died about A. D. 101 or 102. Hence Tertullian wrote this part of his work about 88 or 89 years after John died; after the close of the apostolic age.

5th—We are bound to treat this part of history with the same degree of fairness and candor with which we treat all historic questions. The very historians and writers we will now quote, are largely our historic authorities for the most valuable facts in history and Christianity, and their testimony goes far to determine the very books of the New Testament itself. I could name parties who quote them shamefully.

6th—I shall quote from the correct text, also, as given by

Pamelius, and by Gaigneus, his first editor, and not as in the corrupted copy of Rigaltius; see Wall, i; 61, 62; ii. 613 especially.

7th—To appreciate and understand Tertullian, we must understand his views of baptism. He held that baptism was for the remission of sins; that “all waters * * * do, after invocation of God, attain the sacramental power of sanctification * * * They *imbibe*, at the same time, *the power of sanctifying*.” ch. v. De Baptismo, p. 236, vol. 1. Hence he said, in the same paragraph we wish to quote—

“For no less reason the unmarried should be kept off—[delayed—*procrastinandi*—]who are likely to come into temptation [or trial], as well as *those who never were married, upon account of their coming to maturity*, as those in widowhood for the miss of their partner, until they either marry, or are confirmed in continence.” Wall, i. 58.

Here Tertullian advises all young people, all widows, and unsettled persons, to refrain from baptism, lest they through the many temptations and trials before them, sin after their baptism, and be lost. Will Dr. Graves endorse such sophistry? Will Baptists do so?

These fundamental errors on baptism, as to its design and subjects, naturally led him to oppose infant baptism with still more zeal, as all these objections would bear with additional force against their baptism before whom all of life lay out in the future with all its trials and temptations.

Here, then, are his words, in the same paragraph with the above :

“Therefore, according to the condition and disposition, yea, of the age also of such person, the delay of baptism is the more profitable. Yet more particularly still [*præcipue tamen*] in the case of little children. For what need can there be except in case of necessity—*si non tam necesse*—if not very necessary—i. e., danger of death, as elsewhere his meaning shows,] that the godfathers should be brought into danger? for they also may either fail of their promises by death, or may be mistaken, by a child's proving of a wicked disposition. The Lord indeed said, *Do not forbid them to come unto me.*’ Therefore, let them come when they are grown up; let them come when they can understand: when they can be instructed to what they come. Let them be made Christians when they can know Christ. What need their guiltless age hasten to the remission of sins * * * Let them know how to desire salvation,” etc. Wall, i. 58; Giesler, i. 163.

1. Observe, now, that these little children are too young to give any "promise," but godfathers do this for them. They are of guiltless age; too young to be guilty of wrong. They are too young to enable parents, etc., to discover what is their disposition; not old enough to know what baptism is, nor to desire salvation. They are even too young to be instructed: to know Christ. The term, *parvuli*, applied to them, is constantly applied by the Fathers of that period, to infants from four and eight days old to a year old, as well as to others several years old.

2. Tertullian's opposition shows that Infant Baptism was then practiced in the church. He does not oppose it as a new thing; as an innovation; but as an existing practice. He is led to it by his theory as to baptism, and opposes all young people receiving it; much more little children without guilt.

3. The manner of his opposition shows it to have been universal in the church at that time—eighty-eight to eighty-nine years after the death of John. Look at the facts: Tertullian was a learned, brilliant lawyer, a fine rhetorician. He became the model, in style, to all Roman ecclesiastics; even of the Roman church. He coped with the wits, orators and sophists of Rome, in an age when her horizon was still aglow with the splendors of her declining glory. He was master of the best methods of argumentation, and would use the most telling arguments within his reach.

Had a respectable minority of the churches not baptized infants, infallibly certain it is that he would have at once pointed to that as an important fact; reproached it as an innovation involving complete revolution, and raised a tempest of opposition that would have crushed it. He would have asked them the grounds of their not baptizing infants. All parties in that day, as Neander tells us, claimed apostolic precedent, for what they did. They would have pleaded, therefore, that they were the true followers of the church. Nay, no question one tenth as momentous, as revolutionary, involving such radical changes, infested the church, for the first three hundred years after Christ, as this—nay, in no one age of the past eighteen hundred years did a change take place involving so much of

change in fundamental principles, as a change from "believers baptism," in your sense of the word, to infant baptism. The church would have been rent the moment a party espoused it. A small party, as small they must have been, if so late an innovation as all our opponents contend it was, would have been excommunicated at once; and if they had gained strength and adherents, the world would have been filled with the din and clamor of both parties, as it was on all points of controversy. Had a majority not baptized infants, how triumphantly would Tertullian have appealed to that as a good reason; *vea*, proof that it was not apostolic.

He, soon after this, united with the Montanists, and became a distinguished leader. He wrote learned books, still discussed and referred to baptism, but not a word about infant baptism. It cannot be claimed that his slight opposition had checked it; for, by this time, Origen testifies to it in a manner that perfectly establishes its universality in his day, which was in the latter part of Tertullian's day: hence,

4. Let us now bring in other facts: Origen was the most learned, the most extensive tourist, and therefore extensively informed of all the Fathers in the early centuries. His father was a Christian martyr. His grandfather and great-grandfather were Christians; the latter, contemporary with the apostles. Origen was born A. D., 185: some eighty-four years after John's death. He wrote A. D., 215. He was distinguished as a scholar when only twelve years old. He was fifteen years old when Tertullian espoused Montanism, and was perfectly familiar with affairs in North Africa, where Tertullian lived. His words, in due time we will read. He testifies to the church's giving baptism to infants as a thing unquestioned, and adduces the universal fact to prove a peculiar dogma, as later, Augustine did. In a council, only thirty-eight years later, A. D., 253, in Carthage sixty-six Bishops unanimously decide that it is not necessary to delay baptizing infants till they are eight days old, that being the only issue involved in their case. Wall, 1-79, 83; Cyprian Epis. 66.

The decrees, speedy anathemas, and excommunications of those times,—the action of Victor, Bishop of Rome in the lat-

ter days of Irenæus,—show that all customs and peculiar views of parties were speedily communicated to all other parts in those days. The troubles on fast days in Asia at once came to Rome. See Eusebius' Hist. vol. v. ch. xxiv. Giesler's Ecclesiastical History, volume, i. pages 166–67. Victor excommunicated them on this small matter. Much agitation ensued. Is it not strange that the smallest change, the slightest difference in practice, fasting or keeping a feast on a different day should cause such a commotion over all the church, and yet such a radical revolution as this come in, and no one be able to trace whence, when and where it came in?

The best argument Tertullian could have used would have been to maintain that it was not apostolic. He would have said, “we can settle this matter. Let us consult those venerable men who heard Philip and John preach, and their immediate converts. They will tell us all about the matter.” Plenty of men lived in Tertullian's day who were converts of the apostles. Thousands lived, and many preached, who were disciples of the immediate converts of the apostles. As he was so strongly opposed to infant baptism, he would have asked them and used their information with force; crushing weight. Orchard, the enthusiastic Baptist historian, eulogizes Irenæus, Polycarp, Justin Martyr and Clement, of Alexandria, pages 23, 25, 26 seq., and attaches great importance to their silence on this subject. Let us carefully weigh these matters in view of that silence. Polycarp was a disciple and bosom friend of John for years. He visited Rome about A. D. 160, on ecclesiastical matters, fast days, etc.; Giesler, vol. i. page 167; Eusebius, vol. v. p. 24. Justin Martyr was writing vigorously about A. D. 166, Irenæus, born about A. D. 97, four or five years before John the apostle died, was reared under the care and instruction of John's bosom friend, Polycarp, and often talked with Polycarp about John. All parties are agreed on these facts. See Orchard, 25, 15. Ignatius of Antioch, and Papias, disciples of John, come in here too—distinguished writers and most pious. These men were all most zealous against heresies, and all innovation. They cover the entire space between the apostolic age and A. D. 180. By the

unanimous agreement of immersionists, infant baptism did not exist during this time. This brings us to within ten years of when Tertullian wrote his opposition to it. Ten years space we have now.

But remember Tertullian was then full thirty or thirty-five years old, and was from fifteen to twenty-five years old while most of these men were John's disciples, else as Irenæus, a disciple of his disciple, born four years before John's death. Clemens Alexandrinus wrote his learned works about the same year Tertullian did, and often names baptism. Now we appeal to every candid man, (1) how could such an innovation come in here without detection? (2) How could it spread far and wide throughout the whole church and not be detected?

Infant baptism, if not apostolic, implied, (1), a complete revolution of the whole doctrine of the church. This all can see. Hence it could not come in without producing fearful agitation.

2. A radical revolution in the whole practice of the church. Was Tertullian too stupid, and all his associates claimed by Orchard, Benedict, Ford, etc., to see and oppose such with zeal and argument? Was the whole church so suddenly transformed, that in the short space of ten years she takes on such changes? Yet all writers remain as silent as the grave, while they fill the world with clamor about the smallest questions and simplest issues. Not only did Irenæus write specially against heresies, A. D. 162 and 180, but the pious and learned Hippolytus, A. D., 220, writes a book on heresy and traces all the innovations he knew of. He is contemporary with Tertullian. Why does he not discover the heresy? But Origen, who at twelve years of age drew the attention of the learned by his wonderful powers of mind and proficiency, born A. D. 185, wrote A. D. 215. His father was a Christian martyr of great piety. His grandfather and great-grandfather, contemporary with the apostles, were Christians.

Had Infant Baptism been brought in during this period, how could it have become universal between A. D. 190 and 200? At fifteen years of age, Origen being then admired and sought after by learned ministers, could easily have learned

it. Had it been practiced by only a minority of the churches, he would have known it. His parents and grand parents would have known it, running back even to the apostolic age. How does he speak of it? He says:

“Infants are also by the usage of the church, baptized. The church had from the apostles the injunction (tradition) to give baptism to infants. Infants are baptized for the forgiveness of sins. Of what sins? Or when have they sinned? Or how can any reason of the laver (baptism) in their case hold, but according to that sense that we mentioned even now? No one is free from pollution, though his life be but the length of one day upon earth. And it is for this reason: because, by the sacrament of baptism, the pollution of birth is taken away, that infants are baptized.”

Here, then, are the facts: it is absolutely impossible that Infant Baptism should have come in as an innovation and gotten a deep hold between John and the days of Irenæus, A. D., 162 to 167 or 180. That space is filled up with too many holy and vigilant men. Marcion, Montanus, Cerinthus, Basilides, etc., all come in as heretics, with many others in that period, but all the literature of those times—the very manuscript copies of the Bible—all history marked the advent of all these innovating sects, names, etc. Their heresies are all given elaborately, as might be expected. Then it has to come in between these: between A. D. 180, and A. D. 190, when Tertullian wrote against Infant Baptism, except in case of necessity—danger of death. But Tertullian was then a man of extensive knowledge, a shrewd and noted advocate and capable of observing surrounding events and making inquiry. He had been a Christian fully ten or twelve years, we presume, before he wrote so learnedly on the Bible as he does. Yet under his very eyes the most radical of revolutions starts up; no one knows where, when, nor how, nor by whom; in the short space of ten years, he thirty years old at that time, yet when he comes to oppose it incidentally, only driven to it by his peculiar views of baptism, which we all repudiate, he cannot find a man who agrees with him in his opposition; cannot even build up a sect on that point, and at once the practice is reversed in the church, and no one can tell how! All the great Fathers let it pass unnoticed; the whole church, many of whose ministers were born in apostolic days and suf-

ferred untold persecutions for Christ's sake, rushes into this revolutionizing heresy. Yet it cannot be traced! In A. D., 215, twenty-five years after this, the learned Origen finds it universal. In A. D., 253 and 266, bishops unanimously decree that it is not necessary to delay baptism even until the child is eight days old. Augustine says the whole body of the church, in the case of little infants baptized, who certainly cannot yet believe, or confess, etc., that which the whole church practices; Wall, vol 1, p. 164. Pelagius never heard of any one denying it. Cælestius declares that infants (infantes) are by the law of the whole church baptized (*secundum regulam universalis ecclesiæ*—Sym. Rag. 1, Giesler, vol. 1, p. 334). Nay, as Wall triumphantly proves, there never was, Tertullian excepted, an open, or defined, or organized opposition to Infant Baptism, till A. D., 1522. Not a single fact can be found that is reliable, supporting any other opposition to it, than Tertullian's till A. D., 1522 anywhere.

Paulicians, Manichees or Manicheeans, refused baptism to all parties; would not baptize anybody. This was not opposition to Infant Baptism. Hence the assertions of Robinson, Danvers, Orchard, 35, 36, 49, 69, as samples, are a shame and disgrace to the name of history.

But Tertullian is not the first who refers to Infant Baptism as an existing and recognized fact. The way in which he alludes to it as shown, proves it to have been universally practiced A. D. 190. It could not have crept in between Irenæus, A. D. 180 and 190—in ten years for the reasons given, and not met fearful opposition and exposure. It existed, then, before Irenæus. Nay, Irenæus clearly refers to it, though he uses a word very commonly used then for baptized, viz: regenerate.

Too early the converts from heathenism began to attach to baptism a mystical virtue, as Neander shows and their writings demonstrate, (see Tertullian *De Baptismo*, vol. 1, chapter v. page 236; chapter iv page 232, translated by Alexander, Roberts and Donaldson and Louisville Debate, pages 570–571.) and attributed more and more virtue to the outward ordinance until, at last, they boldly declare baptism, the grace of God

co-operating to effect with it regeneration, to be for remission, and the ordinary means of regeneration. Hence, Irenæus, born while the apostle John yet lived, uses regenerate for baptise, as Wall and A. Campbell so clearly demonstrate. The latter says:

"All the apostolic Fathers, all the pupils of the apostles, and all the ecclesiastical writers of note, of the first four centuries, whose writings have come down to us, alluded to and spoke of Christian immersion (baptism) as the regeneration and remission of sins spoken of in the New Testament."—Mil. Harb. extra. 1830, page 28.

Substantially the same sentiment will frequently be found in his Christianity Restored and Christian System. Justin Martyr speaks so clearly here—A. D. 140, he died about 166, that he cannot be misunderstood. Candidates "are brought by us to where there is water, and are regenerated in the same manner in which we ourselves were regenerated, for they then receive the washing with water in the name of God the Father," etc.

Irenæus uses regeneration repeatedly for baptism. Here are his words as to infants: "For he came to save all by himself; all, I say, who by him are regenerated (i. e. baptized) unto God, infants (infantes) and children, and youth, and elder persons." Well says the candid and patient Dr. Wall, that it "cannot be doubted by any that are at all acquainted with the books of those ages" that the word *regenerate* here signifies baptism. Here is a witness that was born four years before John the apostle died; who lived in the neighborhood of his later labors; who for long years was instructed by John's bosom friend, Polycarp, and tells of his many interviews with him, and how Polycarp often talked of the venerable apostle whom Jesus loved. He distinctly alludes to infant baptism as a practice well understood, and needing no detailed comment. To suppose that he spoke of infants as regenerated to God in the same connection in which he narrates that of older people and all ages, and not including baptism, is infinitely absurd, when we know his style of language and that of his age. But our opponents are compelled to deny, gainsay, raise a dust, and dodge the best way possible; for to admit Irenæus' testimony in the form it is, as proving infant baptism, is to give

up everything; for living contemporary with so many of the ministers ordained by the apostles, and under the care of John's favorite disciple, Polycarp, and seeing that the language assumes it as a matter as well understood and by all admitted as the baptism of all other ages, it is admitting it to be apostolic. Hence our opponents become desperate here, and make very wild assertions.

Historically, it is, therefore, absolutely certain that infant baptism did not begin between the apostolic age and Tertullian, Origen and Cyprian. Therefore, it was apostolic.—*Time out.*]

DR. GRAVES' EIGHTH REPLY

MR. PRESIDENT:—I now notice the ministry of Christ and his apostles, from his baptism until he gave the last commission.

The question to be settled is :

DID CHRIST DURING HIS PUBLIC MINISTRY COMMAND TO BAPTIZE ANY BUT BELIEVERS, OR, DID HIS DISCIPLES BAPTIZE ANY BUT THOSE THEY HAD DISCIPLED BY TEACHING ?

The record of his baptisms during the three and one-half years of his ministry is as explicit as it is brief.

"He *made* and *baptized* more *disciples* than John, though he baptized not but his disciples."—Jno. iii. 22; xxix. 6.

I call the attention of Eld. Ditzler to these facts stated—

1. They were *disciples* whom he is said to have baptized—and there can be no discipleship without previous instruction and faith.

2. That the making or discipling preceded the baptizing of them. Jesus *made* and baptized—not baptized and *made*. The priority is important—that Jesus baptized none but believers is readily conceded by all Commentators not merely partisan.

T. SCOTT.—"The baptism of Jesus was, doubtless, of adults alone."—Com. on John iii. 22-24.

Abp. NEWCOME.—"I suppose it granted that Jesus could not make disciples without instructing them in the nature of His kingdom."—Dura. of our Lord's Min. p. 58.

M. HENRY.—"*He made disciples*: He prevailed with many to embrace His doctrine, and to follow Him as a teacher from God. He baptized those whom He made disciples; admitted them by washing them with water; not Himself, but by the ministry of His disciples."—Com. on John iv. 1, 2.

R. WATSON.—"Our Lord's baptism by His disciples was administered to those Jews that believed on Him as the Messiah; all of whom, like the apostles, waited for a fuller development of His character and offices."

"The disciples" baptized "in the name of Jesus, which was a profession of faith in Him as the Messiah."—Theol. Ins. vol. iv. p. 415; Expo. of Matt. xxviii. 19.

DR. A. BERTH—"John baptized into the faith of the Messiah who was to come, and pointed out His person to the multitude. Jesus baptized into the faith of himself, as having actually come."—Christ our Life, p. 447.

DR. D. DAVIDSON—"It is particularly noticed, that Jesus baptized not those who professed to believe in Him, but His disciples." "The baptism enforced by John most probably was of the same nature as that of Jesus, a rite observed in token of repentance and faith in the immediate appearance of Messiah's kingdom."—Com. on John iv. 1-6.

DR. A. BARNES—"As they were displeased with John, so they were with Jesus, who was doing the same thing on a larger scale—not only making disciples, but baptizing also."—Com. on John iv. 1.

DR. W. SMITH—"Baptism was even during our Lord's earthly ministry the formal mode of accepting His service and becoming attached to His company."—Bib. Dic. Art. Bap.

DR. HALLEY—"We do not maintain, as do many, that our Lord on this occasion instituted Christian baptism, for the apostles under His authority had previously administered it to great multitudes of the Jews" (vol. x. p. 65). He also says that "the opinion of the Pharisees," who "had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John," was that baptism was the sign of discipleship" (vol. x. p. 100; from which I should infer that they knew it not as "the designation of catechumens," that is, of "the unbaptized youth under religious instruction" (vol. xv. p. 106). Such a revelation respecting baptism had not then been given.

It is claimed that Christ's blessing the little children at one time brought to Him and declaring, "of such is the kingdom of heaven," is positive testimony that little children, infants, then belonged to His church and this is to baptize infants. We think it is proof positive to the contrary.

13. "And they brought young children to him, that he should touch them; and *his* disciples rebuked those that brought *them*."

14. "But when Jesus saw *it*, he was much displeased, and said *unto* them, Suffer the little children to come *unto* me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God."

15. "Verily I say *unto* you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein."

16. "And he took them up in his arms, put *his* hands upon them, and blessed them."—Mark x.

Let us see what we can learn from the whole statement.

1. "They brought young children to Him"—for what object?—it is expressed—not to be baptized—but "*that He should touch them*"—but grant that it was to baptize them.

2. "The Apostles rebuked them that brought them." There could have been no infant baptism *prior to this date*, or the Apostles would have known it—for they were the only administrators, and would have been as delighted as the Methodist ministers now are to see them come.

These Apostles, had they been Pedobaptists, would not have refused baptism to the little infants. None but Baptists do this, and these Apostles were Baptists, for they were baptized by a Baptist preacher, and they knew nothing about infant baptism, or infant rites, under the New Dispensation.

3. Christ did not institute infant baptism here, and there would have been the place, if he intended it to be observed. He did not tell His Apostles to baptize these, nor hereafter to baptize others, but he simply put his hands on them and blessed them, and He did not tell His Apostles to do this nor his churches, nor ministers, in after ages, to observe it.

4. But he rebuked his disciples for finding fault with those who brought these children—and he did say, "of such is the Kingdom of Heaven."

What did he mean by the phrase? Evidently not children physically, in size and years; otherwise none but such should compose his church—no adults; and when they grew up into man and womanhood, they would have to be *excluded*. This proves too much. Then he meant in *some likeness*.

Let Christ explain it:

"For verily I say unto you, except ye be *converted* and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. Whosoever, therefore, shall *humble himself as this little child*, the same is greatest," etc.

"Whoever shall not receive the Kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein."

"Except a man be born again"—then he is a little child—an infant indeed, and fit to enter the Church of Christ.

These passages, therefore, teach that there is such a resemblance, or relationship between *a child-like spirit*, and the Church of Christ, as makes the possession of one the condition of the other.

What would not Eld. Ditzler give if he could find here in

his Syriac version, or Arabic even, or Ethiopic, the word *anad* instead of *eulogei* that like a sword, cuts off the very neck of his theory?

I add a few opinions of the most eminent Pedobaptists touching this transaction, men who had their use of infant baptism to defend, as Eld. Ditzler has his, but they were candid, and felt bound to confess the truth.

BP. TAYLOR.—“From the action of Christ’s blessing infants, to infer they are to be baptized, proves nothing so much as that there is a want of better argument. The conclusion would be with more probability derived thus:—Christ blessed infants, and so dismissed them, but baptized them not; therefore infants are not to be baptized” (*Lib. of Prop.*, p. 326).—This is at least a *forcible* argument which Bp. T. thinks the Baptist can adduce.

M. POOLE.—“We must take heed we do not found infant baptism upon the example of Christ in this text; for it is certain that He did not baptize these children.”—*Anno.*, on Matt. xix. 14.

DR. MACKNIGHT says: *Suffer little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not,—for of such is the kingdom of God.* The church of God on earth and His kingdom in heaven, is composed of persons who resemble little children.”—On Matt. xix. 13:

W. BURKITT.—“They were brought unto Jesus Christ: but for what end? Not to baptize them, but to bless them. Christian baptism was not instituted. John’s baptism was the baptism of repentance, of which infants were incapable.”—*Com.* on Matt. xix. 13–15.

DR. DODDRIDGE—“I acknowledge these words of themselves will not prove infant baptism to be an institution of Christ.”—*Note*, on Matt. xix. 14.

DR. LANGE, on “of such is the kingdom of heaven,” says: “According to the parallel passages in Mark and Luke, it must also be regarded as a symbol of a child-like spirit, just as *baptism itself is the type of personal regeneration*”—(*Com.*, on Matt. xix. 13–15).—And yet Dr. L. sees “the un-child-like spirit of Baptists;” and that “the children of *believers* are admitted into the kingdom of heaven;” while “Baptists ignore the possibility of faith as a seed in the heart of infants!”

DR. L. WOODS says: “No one pretends that the children spoken of in this passage were brought to Christ for baptism, or that the passage affords direct proof of infant baptism.”—On Bap., p. 75.

I now meet the question, by the only law for baptism in the Bible, and boldly affirm

INFANT BAPTISM FORBIDDEN BY THE COMMISSION.

This, Eld. Ditzler says, “is the only law for the baptism of any one.” The baptism of believers is specifically instituted here, but no other character is mentioned, and therefore forbidden.

I will only allude to the prohibitory character of the law here, as I reserve its full discussion for the fifth proposition. It is the province of positive law to exclude what it does not specifically include. I will illustrate this. Suppose the government should commission officers to raise a regiment of soldiers, and the order read—"enlisting men six feet high, and between the years of eighteen and forty." Would those officers not know exactly what to do? Would they not violate that order should they enlist men five feet eleven inches? Would they not violate it, should they enlist men seventeen years and eleven months, or forty-one years old? They would, for the simple reason, that positive law excludes what it does not specifically include.

I appeal to these farmers before me. You unite and send your order to McCormick for one thousand dollars' worth of his reapers, and he sends you the reapers, but adds two thousand dollars' worth of his threshers also, and the bill, demanding immediate payment, would you pay it? Why? You know that he sent them without your authority, and contrary to it, for when you specified reapers, you forbade him to send threshers, suppose he should bring suit for his money, and plead that he was authorized, because you did not expressly tell him not to do so—do you think there could be twelve men found in Missouri, who would render a verdict for him on this plea? Christ said, baptize believers, disciples—did he not forbid us to baptize unbelievers, or non-believers, and those incapable of being disciplined? Christ commanded "disciples" to be baptized, says Matthew, and Mark says he specified "*believers*"—both characters imply a previous teaching, to the extent of accepting Christ as a personal Savior. What right, or what authority does this law give Elder Ditzler to baptize one *untaught* or *unbelieving*? To do so, would be to palpably violate the plain letter of the commission, that a child can understand, as well as a Judge of the Supreme Court, Elder Ditzler never did sprinkle an infant except in open violation of this law. But to baptize an *un- or non-believer* first, and then to teach after, is to *invert* the order of the law, which is to pervert and nullify its intent.

Blackstone and all jurists will tell you that the *order* of law is inviolable—for it is the law itself. A suit or indictment not brought in due order, or by the prescribed process is *quashed* and thrown out. No judge will hear the case unless brought in due form of law.

The Lawgiver in Zion, for wise purposes, has established Repentance, Faith and Baptism in the Kingdom of Grace.

What right have churches or ministers to invert this order and teach baptism, faith and repentance? He has commanded Discipleship, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper.

How presumptuously impious to teach men to administer the supper first, then Baptism and then to attempt to disciple—administering the sacred ordinances to unregenerate sinners, which can only be rightly observed by Christians who can spiritually discern the Lord's body! Establish this manner of treating the order of law, and apply it to the affairs of your business, and see how it will work. You order your hands to go break up a piece of prairie, sow it in oats and harrow them thoroughly. They go forth and sow first, then break up and harrow. Or you order them to clear a piece of new ground, burning off the timber, sowing it in wheat, and they first sow the wheat and then clear and burn upon it!

Apply it as you will, to invert the order of your commands is to pervert and nullify them. We may not dare to treat the laws of our king in this way. When he specifies what is to be done and the order, we may not either do something else or do it in a different order. We disobey him in either case. And why should we wish to do it. If he has not told us to baptize our children, why should we desire to do it? Doing it without his express command is an act of will worship—it is doing *our* will and not *his* will. We can only know his will from his word.

But he has not, within the lids of his Revealed Word, commanded infants to be baptized, and it is certain it contains no example of the baptism of an infant, no reward for doing it, no censure for leaving it undone; and how can Eld. Ditzler imagine that it is his will? What right has he to intimate it? But these facts, and they are stern facts, show that Infant

Baptism is not only unauthorized, but forbidden by the very language of the commission. There is not a judge on a bench in all this land, who possesses common intelligence and honesty who would not, under oath, rule that this only law for baptizing any one, forbids the baptism of one incapable of believing or even hearing the Gospel. That judge will tell you that this commission no more includes idiots or unconscious infants and unbelieving children than it does bells and asses, and graveyards and church houses that the Catholics sprinkle in the name of the Trinity, as they do infants, and upon the same authority—that of the Romish church. I would to-day a thousand times rather baptize horses and bells and graveyards than infants.

The teaching and example of the Apostles do not authorize but forbid the practice of Infant Baptism.

The first record of Apostolic baptism we have is at Pentecost. Who were baptized at this time? The heads of families who believed with all their children. Here was the place and this the occasion to have carried the commission to baptize infants into practice, if Christ had given them authority to do so.

Here is where they did baptize infants if anywhere. But if they did teach it or practice it, the Holy Spirit is not a faithful chronicler of the Acts of the Apostles. To say they did is to impeach the faithfulness of the Holy Ghost. If Christ had commanded the Apostles, if he in *any way* had authorized them to baptize infants with their parents, and they did not preach it or practice it here, they were not faithful to their Master. Why will you tenaciously cling to a practice that involves such results? To suppose it practiced, impeaches the fidelity of the Holy Spirit; if authorized by Christ and not practiced, that of the inspired apostles!!

But I affirm they did not with all these 3000, baptize an *infant* or *unbeliever*, but only those “who gladly received the word which they had heard, for when the Holy Spirit says “they that gladly received the word were baptized,” it by logical implication says, none but such were baptized. Now read the last verse. Who were added to the Church daily during this

great revival? Not, as our version unfortunately reads, "such as *should* be saved," but those who are saved—i. e., "*the saved*." I have not often corrected our common version, and when I have, it is to give you a literal *primary* meaning, instead of a secondary or *figurative* one. You will bear me witness that I have strictly adhered to the Rules of Interpretation, to which we both assented the first day. I have in every case insisted upon the literal and *grammatical* construction of the sacred text, as my opponent has universally insisted upon a *secondary*, or a *remote* and *unusual signification* of the term. Our translators were Episcopalians, and their creed colored their translation here. It is the practice of the Church of England as of all State Churches, and of the Methodist Societies, to add *all that should be saved* to the church, and thus make the Church co-extensive with the nation or the world. But not a scholar or commentator on earth supports this translation, and the original forbids it.

We find here the definite article *tous* before the participle *soudzomenous*, and the law of the language is, that a definite article before a participle must be translated as a relative pronoun, and the participle in the indicative of its own tense. Every scholar knows this and every-school boy should know it. Then there is no such intimation here of such as "should be," but literally the saved—grammatically, those who were saved. Read the record, then, as it was indited by the Holy Spirit. The Lord added to the Church those who were saved. They were not added, i. e. baptized—for by no other act can you add—to the church in order to save them, either by conferring upon them remission, regeneration or justification; but they were added because they had been remitted, justified, regenerated, and therefore saved—no living unconscious infant ever was justified or regenerated or could be said, in any sense to be saved, and, therefore, they were not added to the church with their believing parents on this occasion, but the Record tells us *they were not*, or it is an unfaithful chronicler of the Acts of the Apostles.

I know not a standard commentator who does not endorse my rendering of *tous soudzomenous* here. Even Alexander

Campbell immolated his system upon the altar of his scholarship here—he translates it as I do—so Bloomfield, and Alford and Barnes, and others. But if no others, the Holy Spirit says so. It must be conclusive with my opponent when I quote his great teacher, Dr. Adam Clarke :

“*And the Lord added to the church daily, such as should be saved.*”] Though many approved of the life and manners of these primitive Christians, yet they did not become members of this holy church ; God permitting none to be *added* to it, but *tous soudzomenous, those who were saved* from their sins and prejudices. The church of Christ was made up of *saints* ; *sinner*s were not permitted to incorporate themselves with it.”

The Lord added *the saved* to the church, and none else. This is the Lord’s order and the Lord’s practice. Jno. Wesley and the Methodist Discipline say, that, an infant while it lives is not saved, but *lost*, and is a *child of wrath*.” Nor is a seeker, one who simply desires to flee the wrath to come, saved, and, therefore, should not be baptized. But baptism adds to the church—it is *the* initiatory rite according to my friend’s Discipline, and in this one thing I admit it agrees with the word of God. Therefore, *infants* and *unsaved persons* are not authorized to be baptized, but they are forbidden by this record, as by all other records of the Acts of the Apostles.

Refutation.

ARG. XXVII. That practice which tends neither to glorify God, nor to the profit of the child, when grown up, but may prove hurtful, and endanger his salvation, cannot be of God, and to teach and practice it is a sin against both God and man.

But infant baptism does not tend to the glory of God, for he has nowhere required it, but by the very words of the commission, forbidden it, and how can God be glorified by man’s disobedience, or by his practicing contrary to his Word, or doing what He hath not required ! Read Lev. x. 1, 2. Neither does it profit the child. The Bible contains no promises to a sprinkled child. The advocates of infant sprinkling have been searching for it for upwards of fifteen centuries in vain. But that the practice has a very dangerous influence on the subject in after years, cannot be questioned, if he believes the creed and catechism of the church that performed it, for each, whether Catholic or Protestant, teaches a man, that in and by the act, he was regenerated, or made a member of Christ, heir of God, and inheritor of the kingdom of heaven, all the blessings of the covenant of grace sealed to him.

Ergo—We must conclude that infant baptism is not of God, and that to teach and practice it is a sin against God and man.

ARG. XXVIII. Whatever rite puts it out of the power of a child, when it comes to years of discretion to obey Christ, or obtain the answer of a good conscience, is evidently not of God, for Christ would not make any given act a duty and obligatory upon a believer which he had contravened, rendered nugatory and impossible, by a previous one.

(2). Infant Baptism does this. The child that is sprinkled in infancy, cannot obey Christ in baptism for his parents performed the duty *for him*. They can repent for him as well. If there were none but Pedobaptist churches, he never could obey Christ, or obtain the answer of a good conscience.

ERGO.—Infant Baptism cannot be of God.

ARG. XXIX. (1). Any religious rite that necessarily generates in the subject or others wrong notions of personal religion, or is calculated to implant unbelief in personal religion is not of God, and is subversive of the Christian religion and pernicious to the souls of men.

(2). Infant Baptism does this. All Pedobaptist countries are proof of it. Every infidel in England, Germany, Italy, Prussia or Russia, is a member of a Pedobaptist church. While the overwhelming mass, though unregenerate, rely implicitly upon the efficacy of their Infant baptism to save them, they urge with reason that they are saved without personal repentance or faith, if the teachings of their church be true.

(3). Therefore Infant Baptism is not of God, and is subversive of the Christian Religion, and pernicious to the souls of men.

ARG. XXX. (1). If Christ, when he gave the commission for baptizing, specified the character to be baptized, as the one believing, he forbade the baptism of any other.

(2). But he did specify the one believing. Ergo, He did forbid the baptism of unbelieving infants or adults,—bells, horses, etc.

ARG. XXXI. (1). Christian Baptism is, in *every* case, an act of *personal* OBEDIENCE. A law, and a knowledge of it, and volition, are *essential* to obedience.

(2). Infant Baptism is not an act of obedience in *any* sense, since it is nowhere commanded. Since it is nowhere commanded, there is no law for it, and if there were, an infant could have no knowledge of it, or volition concerning it.

(3). Therefore Infant Baptism cannot be considered Christian Baptism in any sense.

ARG. XXXII. (1). Christian Baptism is in every case an act of religious *worship*, since obedience is the highest act of worship.

(2). Infant baptism is in no case an act of worship, because not an act of obedience.

(3). Therefore Infant Baptism is in no case Christian Baptism.

ARG. XXXIII. (1). It is sinful to neglect anything required of God.

(2). It is not sinful to neglect Infant Baptism, says a Presbyterian. See Tract.

(3). Therefore Infant Baptism is not required of God.

DR. DITZLER'S NINTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—We have in, all the evidence we want—four times as much as we need. We now have nothing to do but drive back our foe—meet his assaults. This consists simply in a running fight—no hand to hand contest. He settles upon no real, persistent line of attack. He is like a man assailing an immense tower of adamant, who, instead of steadily assailing one point in hope of effecting a breach, simply pitches little pebbles at the entire building.

He smarts under the keen lashing we gave him on hereditary religion, etc. He wishes now to modify it very much. I am glad he felt the rebuke. He did contrast the religion John preached with that had up till then thus—“Now all stand on their individuality—they can't inherit religion now.” He used those very words and I wrote them down from his lips. Also—“it (religion) don't come down by genealogy.”

We showed distinctly

1. That they were not in our sense believers whom John baptized from Luke iii. 15-16, and Mat. ix. 14. See also Acts xix. 1-15.

2. If they had been, baptizing believers who are adults “unto repentance,” this did not prevent baptizing infants who needed no repentance.

3. John baptized that Christ might be revealed to Israel. John i. 33. If he did not baptize infants these two facts were sufficient reasons—“unto repentance” and that Christ might be made known to the people.

4. Those baptized by John had not received, and did not therein receive the Spirit. Hence it was wholly defective—preparatory.

5. Baptism by the church is not for either of the two only things John said it was for—hence all deductions therefrom as to adults or infants are wrong.

Doctor Graves says God don't require any thing till the parties can understand it.

1. Why did the Apostolic church circumcise infants then?

2. Why did they take them up to the temple to do with them after the manner of the law?

3. Why were eight thousand six hundred of them "from a month old and upward, keeping the charge of the sanctuary" set apart to that work by the Almighty? Num. iii. 28.

Late in the Apostolic history, special laws were enacted to stop circumcision among the Gentiles, both of infants and adults. See Acts xv.

Now where was the positive law ejecting him from membership?

He says Zachariah, Mary, etc. were not in the church. Let us look at the situation then.

1. There is no church in John's day, so Doctor Graves holds.

2. Then his baptism put nobody into any church. Baptism is no initiatory rite yet then.

3. The Twelve, 70, the 120, the seven deacons of Acts vi. are nowhere represented as baptized. Now we desire to know—

4. How these ever got into the church from the immersion stand-point? You say the church was not organized by John, but by Christ on the Mount, Mat. v. vi. vii., where he preached the sermon. Well then,

5. Here we see (1) a church not named—(2) organized, yet not named—no hint (3) no local congregation; (4) no officers elected (5) and the Apostolic college not yet filled up. He selected one or two—Matthew among them, after this sermon, ch. ix. 9.

What was done on the Mount to organize a church? He had selected disciples before—ch. iv., and the rest afterwards—ch. ix. 9 seq.

Now if a man's life or liberty depended on it, and you were to prove that you had organized a Baptist church, and if you failed to do so, life was forfeited, and you offered no more evi-

dence than you have done or can do, to prove that Christ organized a church on the Mount, you know that before any Baptist jury on earth you would lose your case—the life that hung on it. But where is the entrance? Where is your baptism? We have the church organized—no local congregation, no deacons, no elders,—no baptism!

In a few days Matthew joins the church, then, please tell us, how does he get in? They do not baptize him. Seventy more join—no account of baptism. And so—up till Pentecost there is not the notice or record of the baptism of a single one who associates with Christ. How then can you regard baptism as a condition of membership when such is the New Testament record? No Sir, there is no hint or sign of the organization of a church anywhere in all Christ's ministry.

He tells of one person regretting being baptized in infancy, What argument is there in that? Here behind me now sits a preacher whose wife always regretted not being baptized in infancy, and here is Bro. Dockery who regrets he had not quit the Baptists sooner, but do you hold that as proof Baptists are all wrong?

The Doctor gets confused on Philip and the Eunuch. No Sir, the text is not in any ancient Greek Bible, nor in the manuscripts of any version of the first six centuries of the church—merely inserted—doubtful—in modern editions from old manuscripts. But A. Clarke thinks Eph. ii. 16, “new man” means new church. But Paul took a different view, and Olshausen takes the right view of Paul—viewing it as we do. John iv. 2—Christ by his disciples “made and baptized more disciples. But what does that prove? Does it show that they failed to baptize the infants? Did they organize those baptized into churches? Nothing of the kind.

On John iii. 5, we have given our exposition, and he cannot touch it. As to commentators, nine-tenths of them all hold with us on all the essentials of these points. We prefer exposing the Doctor's errors, and presenting clear expositions of truth to long quotations and compilations from commentators. As to controversialists, we know it hurts them sorely,

that at last a number of us have taken the field and they are compelled to take down their colors or have them taken down for them.

He says "you can't make a disciple of an infant." Here is now his position. The commission says—"Go, disciple all the nations, baptizing them, etc." Now says the doctor—you can't disciple an infant, hence, he can't be baptized. To that we reply.

1. All the best and most critical commentators assert that *mathæteuo* disciple, does not necessarily include previous teaching. So Clarke, Alford, Olshausen, Stier, Lightfoot, etc., etc.

2. The New Testament puts it in evidence that this is correct. In Matt. iv., Christ sees Peter and others fishing, and says: "Follow me, and they arose and followed him." So Matt. ix. 9—he called to Matthew—"follow me"—and he did so. Now here is the most important act of discipleship, yet no previous teaching in either case.

3. In the next place Paul puts it in evidence that in infancy parties can be disciplined. 2 Tim. iii. 15-16, Timothy learned, and had been taught the Scriptures—that is discipling—teaching from your own standpoint—*apo brephous* from infancy. So the Greek reads. He will not deny but that *brephæ* is the Greek word for infant. It covers the age from birth till three to five years old generally. Timothy's mother and grandmother had exerted an influence on his very infancy, and had made him a disciple in Doctor Graves' sense of the term. Then here by the terms of the commission you are commanded to baptize infants as much as adults. All that can be disciplined are to be baptized.

But no class is so easily disciplined even using the word in Doctor Graves' sense, as "little children" or "infants." How old does an infant have to be before it can be taught?

Let us suppose for the sake of argument that Doctor Graves is entirely right in all this. Then we assert that still it leaves us in the right, and places him in the attitude of rebellion against Apostolic authority, for how old must a little child be before it can be taught? How old ere it can be influenced to

falsehood, deception, error or to truth, to obedience, and love and faith?

Truth is the valuable lesson. At three years old—at two and a half in some cases, at three and a half and four in nearly all cases, infants can be taught valuable lessons of Scriptures. My little daughter—just three years old (Mary) can now answer many Bible questions. So can yours? Well, as soon as they can be taught, from your interpretation, they are proper subjects of baptism. Now what will you do with that point?

He says that I said there was no proof that certain parties were baptized. Of all of whom we said such thing, we ask for the refutation of it. We said generally there was no “record.” Nor is there. It is objected that there is no express command to baptize infants. No express mention of it in the New Testament. No recorded case of infant baptism in the New Testament, etc., etc.

Against all that we say emphatically—

1. There is no express, or non-express, mention in the New Testament of women taking the Lord’s supper. By your logic you should exclude them.

2. It is nowhere recorded where John ever baptized a woman. So by your logic they should not be baptized.

3. There is no record, nor proof that the Twelve Apostles were ever baptized by anybody.

4. There is no record where John the Baptizer was ever baptized.

5. There is no record where the twelve ever baptized anybody in all their ministry.

6. There is no record where any of the seventy disciples were baptized.

7. There is no record of any one that was baptized by them.

8. There is no record where any one of the hundred and twenty disciples were baptized.

9. There is no record where Ananias, who baptized Paul, was himself baptized.

10. There is no record where the seven deacons were baptized.

11. There is no record where an infant was circumcised in all apostolic history; yet all agree and know they were circumcised every week and often every day of the Apostolic history

The sum of it is then that where so many important cases of presumed baptism took place, yet not one of them ever named or hinted, it is not surprising that the baptism of infants should not be named, when the Jews had such matters always attended to privately in most cases.

All your objections are here more than met—utterly crushed.

He now quotes Mark xvi, 15, 16:

“Go ye, preach my Gospel to every creature. He that *believeth* and is baptized, shall be saved. He that believeth not shall be damned.”

This text, he thinks, excludes infants.

1. Supposing it to be genuine—for all scholars who are versed in manuscript authority and literature now agree those verses were not written by Mark, but by a later hand. And they are not in any Greek Bible earlier than the sixth century, then marked doubtful in the first they occurred in—but grant them to be genuine,

2. They do not exclude infants unless they are excluded from salvation. All whom this text denies baptism to are damned, if your interpretation be correct, for all who believe not shall be damned. If infants are denied baptism because they cannot believe, evidently they are damned.

But you will say it was not meant to apply to infants, only to those capable of being intelligently preached to, and so held responsible for rejecting the Gospel. No doubt that is the meaning intended. And then the sense is—all who accept the Gospel, being baptized (*baptistheis*), having been baptized, shall be saved. He that rejects—disbelieves—shall be damned.

Now, if otherwise you hold it, then you must preach to beasts, animals—they are creatures. But it—supposing it a genuine document—must be explained in the light of Scripture teaching and fact. Hence, it in no wise debar infants from baptism.

On the commission, the Doctor says the specification of one class, is the forbidding of all others. But where is any one class specified by the commission?—disciple all nations. Does it name men, women, boys, girls? Does it designate adults? It solely rests for interpretation on existing, established custom, practice. In any other light you cannot make sense of the commission. Only by the past custom would you know that water was to be used in baptism. Only by it would they understand discipling. Take Mark's so-called account—for it was not his—that all candid critics now agree—though they defend its inspiration—Alford, Tregelles, etc. "He that believeth." Believeth what? What are they to preach? We are compelled to explain it in the light of established precedents, as all such documents are.

On Acts viii, 37, he says we have to throw out Scripture to support Infant Baptism. What did A. Campbell, Anderson, Wilson, in their three immersion versions throw it out for? Because honest in it, and though the Baptist Union Bible puts in a note that it is wanting in the best copies—words to that effect, yet they were too dishonest to act consistently. On not half as much evidence against a text, they do reject whole texts and a number of them, yet retain this, one of the clearest forgeries in the text. Tregelles well remarks on it, If Acts viii, 37, is to be received, then may men compose Scripture at will. That is the tone of his criticism which I have here. The point then is, Baptists need forgeries to oppose Infant Baptism. He tells you it is in my Syriac, "in brackets." Yes, marked as doubtful, is wanting in all ancient copies. No ancient copy of the Syriac, Greek, or Latin has it. It was forged by the Catholics to support confession before baptism in adult cases, as the Eunuch was an adult.

Alas! the Doctor comes back with a load of his syllogisms. They will look rich on paper. Look at another specimen. "Infant Baptism is totally opposed to the spirit of Christianity." Here is his premise. Is it not the very thing in debate? Do you call that logic that begs the question?—that assumes as true the whole matter that is denied, or assumes as untrue the whole matter that is affirmed? And he calls

such scraps, stolen from a feast of logic, the genuine article itself!! Now if he wished to improve a little, he would put it thus

1. Whatever is opposed to God's Word, is to be rejected. (We all agree to this—it is legitimate with Christians). Then

2. Infant Baptism is opposed to the Word of God. Now he must stop and *prove* that. That is the point in debate. Having satisfied all of his ability to prove this, then—

3. Therefore Infant Baptism is to be rejected. But he would not give reasons if they were as plentiful as blackberries, especially “on compulsion.”

He says they baptized doubting Christians, if I understood him. “He that doubts is damned.” No such record in the Bible. People may be weak in faith, may be in doubt on many things, but to baptize people of responsible years who were believing John to be the Christ, would be a poor beginning of the thorough work he so eulogized. Especially when not one received the Spirit; and “if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His.”

He says “Christ nailed *the whole moral law—all* to the cross. We do not get to Heaven by keeping the moral law.” *Can we get there if we live in violation* of it? Where does he say he “nailed the whole moral law to the cross?” That is Baptist Scripture, a forgery is badly needed there.

All that he took out of the way has no need of being kept—was removed because unprofitable. So Paul tells us. Now then we have no need of loving God with all our heart—it is of no profit—nor our neighbor—and as “love is the fulfilling of the law,” we have no need of that, the whole moral law is removed, and murder, hate and crime are no impediments to Godliness!! Such is the Doctor's position, such the straits he gets into, all to get rid of infants! Verily they give him much trouble and cause him to fall into divers temptations, to most glaring inconsistency.

He insists that proselyte baptism was two centuries after Christ. He must prove something there, **assertion amounts to**

nothing, especially after the terrible exposure of his mere assertions the last few days.

He dashes at Tertullian, quotes him on mode, a matter disposed of, strikes at the late revivalists, to much of which we say *Amen*. But it has nothing to do with our question. The *parvuli*, diminutive of *parvus*, a child, hence *parvuli* are little children, and repeatedly interchanged with *infantes*, infants, by those Fathers. Repeatedly where one uses "little children," another says *infants*, just as Luke says "infants" where Matthew and Mark say "little children."

He hints that there may have been interpolation in Tertullian. That is simply on a par with his whole course in this debate, whip around, raise dust, dodge off. No one pretends that there is interpolation here. Tertullian is most naturally led to his opposition to Infant Baptism from his isolated and strange view of religion. He opposes all young people and widows from embracing it, and those reasons pressed by him necessarily drove him into opposition to Infant Baptism. By the gentleman's course, of pretending to raise doubts as to the authenticity of a text never questioned, we could then do the same by any chapter or point in the Bible or history, and the whole be turned into a sea of uncertainty. Only where by not being found in the body of the oldest and best copies of given works do candid men pretend to allow of doubt as to verses and sections of writers, unless in case of copying a word, by mistake a single letter or word is supposed to creep in sometimes, especially when very much like another word.

The forgery of Acts viii, 37 is easily made out. The reasons for the forgery are apparent also. The church Monks held it to be unallowable that a sinner should be baptized without confessing. Hence they put in the words, "If thou believest with all thy heart thou mayest. And he said I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." It is forgery throughout. As we said, Baptist Revision Unions have thrown out words and texts on not half the evidence there is against this text. They could not afford to give up such a favorite passage. Is it not strange that the two main texts relied on against the infants are in the extremest doubts, the

one a palpable forgery, the other in no copy of the Bible known until the sixth century! That was late to come in.

We have established infant membership, which carries with it Infant Baptism. We have shown Infant Baptism independent of the including major proposition, or genus embracing the species. He has not been able to jostle a single point, so it all stands.—[*Time Out.*]

DR. GRAVES' NINTH REPLY.

MR. PRESIDENT:—I will now proceed to call your attention to the

GREAT REVIVAL AT SAMARIA.

Does not the Holy Spirit faithfully tell us all who were baptized on *this* occasion? He does, or he is an unfaithful historian. And who does he say were baptized at Samaria and formed the first church there? “Those that believed” etc.; therefore I am authorized to say—and *none else*—“both men and women.” Now, just one more word here---“and their children,” would have sufficed to authorize Infant Baptism. If it had said so, no Baptists on earth would have objected. But that “both” is a troublesome stone here, as it was in the case of the Eunuch’s immersion, where the Holy Spirit repeated it for peculiar emphasis, that “they went down both into the water *both* Philip and the Eunuch etc,” a death-blow to the claims of sprinkling. And here it is definitive, and conclusive; for “both” cannot, as every school boy knows, be used with reference to *three* persons or things. Only *two* classes were baptized here, *i. e.* men and women.

In a public discussion at Denmark, Tenn., with the late Dr. R. Burrows, he publicly admitted to me when pressed close with this “both” that he did not believe that any infants were baptized in the city of Samaria on this occasion, or the Holy Spirit was an unfaithful chronicler of events. This was frank in a great champion as Dr. Burrows was in his day.

Now I ask Elder Ditzler before this audience to say if he can believe with this passage before him, that men, women and infants were baptized at Samaria, if not, why not? I am willing to rest the whole question on the second of Acts and this passage. The next instance of baptism is that of

THE ETHIOPIAN EUNUCH.

Philip observed the law of baptism here. He first disciplined

and demanded a cordial faith in Christ and then he immersed him. We can understand from this what Pete meant by the answer of a good conscience toward God. The Eunuch's conscience was answered, and he went on his way rejoicing. Ah, but this thirty-seventh verse is spurious, say Eld. Ditzler. May be so. Let it be granted that this verse was added by some later hand, and we claim it at once as an indisputable proof of what common opinion sanctioned in post-apostolic times. Such an interpolation never could have been made when the church was in the habit of sprinkling infants. What would our Pedobaptist friends say to our introducing similar verse now. There is no conceivable explanation of how it came to be where it is, but that it was regarded by some transcriber as essential to account for the Ethiopian's baptism by the evangelist, and there is no explanation how this insertion obtained sufferance but that such a demand and such a reply were in harmony with the customs of the age. In support of this view, I need but cite Dean Alford's note his words are:

"The insertion appears to have been made to suit the formularies of the baptismal liturgies, it being considered strange that the Eunuch should have been baptized without some such confession."

The Dean may or may not have perceived the significance of his admission, but it seems too obvious to call for anything beyond the simple expression of our thanks for the testimony to ancient practice it supplies. God makes the wrath of man to praise him.

But the learned Dr. Stier whom Elder Ditzler has often quoted, says:

"Though Acts viii. 37, may not be regarded as genuine, it expresses only the genuine truth. Indeed after the deception practiced by Simon "with all thine heart," seems exceedingly appropriate and thus speaks for its genuineness."—Words vol. 8, p. 332.

DR. A. BARNES, speaking of the possibly spurious 37th verse, says. "It contains however, an important truth, elsewhere abundantly taught in the Scriptures, that *faith* is necessary to a proper profession of religion."

I next notice what is said of *The Baptism of Households*:

THE CASE OF LYDIA, ACTS XVI. 14-40.

The record of her conversion and baptism is brief and clear. The Lord opened her heart to attend to the things spoken—

just as he does the sinner to-day—the Spirit of God must first open the heart for the word to enter effectually, for the bare word never did or will open a sinner's heart, and he cannot open it himself. Lydia was discipled and then baptized, and her household. Whether she had children along with her on this trading expedition, three hundred miles from home, I know not—Eld. Ditzler tells us the Syriac says “Lydia and her children,” but God's word don't say children, and therefore the Syriac is not true to the original here—but whether her household consisted of relatives or servants, or children, it matters not—they, like Lydia, were *discipled*, they were *adults*. We read in verse forty, that the Holy Spirit calls them *brethren*, who could be comforted by the presence of Paul and Silas. Infant children never are called brethren in God's Word, and not even in the Syriac, or any other language. One thing is certain, there were no children baptized here.

THE JAILOR'S FAMILY, ACTS XVI. 22–35

The record is clear in this case also. The Jailor finding all safe brought Paul and Silas out of the prison, and asked what he should do to be saved. He was told how he and his household also might be saved, viz : by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. We next find Paul and Silas preaching the gospel to all in the Jailor's house. They did not preach to unconscious babes, if he had any. If he had, it was quite unnecessary to formally except them. When we ascribe anything to a family of which infants are incapable, we do not think of formally excepting them. Accepting the gospel, the Jailor and all his family were immersed the same hour of the night. Where, whether in the baths in the Courts of the prison—which were wont to be, and are today in all Eastern prisons, as in most of ours—or in the river that flowed by the city, we are not told, but one thing we know, not in the Jailor's house, for after the baptism he brought them back again, or up into his house, for the Greek verb *anago*, means to lead up or to *lead back*, and of course they had been out of it—he rejoiced believing with all his house. We see here that all of his house who are *mentioned* or referred to in *this* record, were capable of both believing and rejoicing. as all in

Lydia's house could be comforted, and of course I am willing for such to be baptized.

As these cases will come up again under another proposition, I defer giving the opinion of the most eminent Pedobaptist critics.

In all the Acts of the Apostles, in all their recorded ministry, only five households are said to have been baptized, and of three of these, it is expressly related that all in the house could perform acts that can be predicated of believers only.

Why sir, the baptisms of households is nothing rare with us Baptists. A Brother near Kansas City Mo., this fall baptized four entire households in *one day*, having thirteen children in them and no infants. Dr. Breaker who sits here on my left, has baptized already twice as many households as are recorded of all the apostles, and Bro. W. M. Lea of Arkansas. I see here on my right, has already baptized nine households. Eld. B. N. Crawford of Pike county Miss., has baptized seventeen, and Eld. S. G. Jenkins of Oxford, Ala., thirteen; and in the last few weeks there has been published in *The Baptist*, which I edit, two hundred and ten household baptisms by Baptist ministers in the South, covering a less period of time than is embraced in the record of the Apostles' ministry. I will append the list to the record as the final refutation of this argument from household baptisms.*

* S. C. Kirkland, Hopeville, La., 6; T. A. Kenton, Harrisburg La., 2; Ira H. Bees, Lampasas, Texas, 1; J. F. McLendon Carthage Texas, 4; P. A. Haman, De Valls Bluff, Ark., 1; L. Ball, many and since, 2; G. D. Stanton, Canton, Texas, 1; G. A. Grammar, Yazoo City, Miss., 1; T. L. Talbert, Black Hawk, Miss., 1; J. W. Wentworth, Shady Grove, Florida, 4; M. P. Lowrey, Ripley, Miss., several others 2; Caswell Smith, Haw Ridge, Ala., 2; G. W. Martfield, DeSota, La., 2; M. Lambright, Douglasville, Texas, 1; T. T. Eaton, Petersburg, Virginia, 2; John Windham, Texarkana, Arkansas, 2; W. A. Gaines, Chester, South Carolina, 2; R. A. Lee, Carsons Landing, Mississippi, 2; J. H. Barnum, Durhamville, Tennessee, 41; J. G. Westerson, Woodville, Texas, 6; W. A. Agee, Town Creek, Alabama, 2; J. W. Creevelson, Illinois, 1; O. F. Gregory, Charleston, South Carolina, 1; J. M. Hart, Eldorado, Arkansas, 11; H. P. Hamstel, Knox county, Tennessee, 1; R. A. Speer, Cherokee, Alabama, 2; B. A. Crawford, Pike county, Mississippi, 17; J. D. Fletcher, Lonoke, Arkan-

Eld. J. H. Borum, of Durhamville, Tenn., whom I well know, has baptized forty-one households in his single ministry, and may as many more before he dies.

But leading Pedobaptist Commentators are free to admit that the argument from the baptism of households is of no force.

ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES.—“And entered into the house of Lydia: doubtless to confirm them in the faith which they had preached to them—Lydia and hers hearing of their miraculous deliverance could not but be comforted and confirmed in the truth.”

BAXTER.—“His house would not be saved for his faith, without any of their own” (*Par. on N. T.*, on Actt xvi, 31). “They instructed him and his household, that they might indeed believe and be saved” (on v. 32). “He and all his house were presently baptized, as having professed their resolved faith in Christ” (on v. 33). Further, “The apostles delayed not baptism, when serious profession gave them right.”

DR. A. BARNES.—“Salvation was offered to his family as well as himself; implying that if they believed they should also be saved. 32. *To all that were in his house.* Old and young. They instructed them in the doctrines of religion, and doubtless in the nature of the ordinances of the gospel.”—*Com. on Acts xvi. 31, 32.*

My next argument is

THE ESSENCE AND ADMITTED SYMBOLISM OF BAPTISM NOT ONLY DOES NOT WARRANT, BUT CONFESSEDLY FORBIDS AND PRECLUDES THE IDEA OF INFANT BAPTISM.

I prefer to let eminent Pedobaptist scholars and commentators maintain the truth of this by their testimony:

PRES. EDWARDS.—“Baptism, by which the primitive converts were admitted into the church, was used as an exhibition and token of their

sas, 1; W. D. Jordan, Hickory Hill, Missouri, 2; A. M. Russell, Forest City, Arkansas, 6; W. T. Fleenor, Missouri, 3; T. J. Humble, Columbus, Louisiana, 1; C. B. Eagerton, Marion, South Carolina, 2; L. R. Burris, Baldwin, Mississippi, 2; J. J. DeBoise, Olive Branch, Mississippi, 1; P. B. McCarroll, Rockford, Tennessee, 1; W. G. Inman, Nashville Tennessee, 3; R. R. White, Frier's Point, Mississippi, 1; S. G. Jenkins, Oxford, Alabama, 13; G. W. Durham, Carroll, Mississippi, 1; T. E. Muse, Evergreen, Louisiana, 2; J. Jones, Porkville, Mississippi, 1; D. H. Burt, 1; A. Fitzgerald, Emory, Texas, 1; H. Z. Livery, Quitman, Texas, 4; W. P. Throgmartin, Illinois, 3; B. B. Hinton, Buna Vista, Georgia, 1; N. Jordan, North Vernon, Indiana, 2; W. J. Slinker, Washington, Arkansas, 2; T. H. Pettit, Mayfield, Kentucky, 1; W. W. Keep, Texas, 3; J. W. Lipsey, Coldwater, Mississippi, 6; L. R. Scruggs, Texas, 2; W. M. Lea, Arkansas, 9; J. M. D. Breaker, St. Joseph, Missouri, 10; Eld. Reese Texas, 1. Total 210.

being visibly regenerated, dead to sin; as is evident by Rom. vi. 4, 18, throughout." "He does not mean only that their baptism laid them under special obligation to these things, and was a mark and token of their engagement to be thus hereafter: but was designed as a mark, token, and exhibition of their being visibly *thus already*."—Enqui. into Qual. for full Commu.

VENEMA.—"Faith and repentance are pre-required in baptism. He who presents himself as a candidate for baptism, professes by that very act to be a Christian, declares himself to have passed into the discipline of Christ."

C. TAYLOR.—"In baptism we profess death unto sin. The apostle's purpose is one, though his similes be three. He exhorts that (1) after *baptism* we should walk in newness of life: that (2) after *transplantation* we should conform to the holiness and resurrection of Christ: that (3) after *crucifixion* we should 'yield ourselves unto God as those who are alive from the dead, and our members as instruments of righteousness unto God.' We are now prepared to understand a literal version of the argument, 'How shall we who are dead to sin live any longer therein? Know ye not that whosoever of us are baptized unto a profession of Jesus Christ, are baptized unto a profession of His death?' etc.—Facts and Evi., etc., pp. 50, 50.

Dr. GOODWIN.—"He argues from the known and generally-received profession and practice of *all* Christians. *Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized*—that is, whoever of us that profess baptism into Christ, profess baptism into His death, as the thing intended by it."—Works, vol. iv. p. 30.

VITRINGA:—"To be baptized into Christ is beyond doubt to be baptized into this, that each should profess his communion with Christ; that each by that baptism, as by a sign and testimony, should avow that he had believed in Christ."—Obs. Sac, iii, 22. 822.

RIGBYLTIUS.—"Men are not born Christians, but made such. No man is accounted a believer till he knows Christ. Therefore he must first hear what belongs to the Christian faith; and when he has heard and embraced it from his belief, he may be called a believer: and that the things which have entered his mind through his ears may by an (external) sign be submitted to his eyes, and may strike his mind the more powerfully, he is dipped or immersed in water, in a river, fountain, pool or laver. And as he had received three things;—for first he received faith, and then by faith obtained the pardon of all his past sins; and, moreover, had the pledge of a resurrection to eternal life: so these things are signified by baptism."—In Facts opposed to Fiction, p. 54.

R. BAXTER.—"Know ye not that when men are baptized they are by vow, covenant, and profession, listed into the belief of a crucified Savior, who died for sin to save us from it; and do profess that repentance by which we renounce it, as dead to it for the time to come? Therefore in our baptism we are dipped under the water, as signifying our covenant profession; that as He was buried for sin, we are dead and buried to sin;

that as the glorious power of God raised Him from the dead, so we should rise up to live to Him in holiness and newness of life" (*Par. on N. T.*, on Rom. vi. 3, 4). "To be buried and risen with Christ signifieth, A being dead to sin, and alive to God and newness of life: and it is not only (as is feigned by the opposers) an engagement to this for the future, but a profession of it also at the present" (*Dispu. of Right to Sac.*)

Bp. PATRICK.—"We are baptized unto His death—we are buried with Him in baptism." "We by going into the water profess that we are willing to take up the cross, and die for Christ's sake."—In Booth's *Pæd. Ex.* vol. i. p. 136.

THERE WAS NO INFANT IN THE CHURCH AT ROME.

I open the epistle that Paul addressed to the church, and I see that he spoke of *all that were in Rome*, as "beloved of God," "saints," and this significant expression in Ch. i. 8:

"8. First, I thank my God through Jesus Christ for you all, that your faith is spoken of throughout the whole world."

I turn to chapter vi. and read a few verses, from 1-8.

This could not have been addressed except to a body of professed believers in Christ. Let the honest inquirer read the whole epistle, and see in every chapter abundant proof that all the members of this church were professed saints—believers in Christ.

THERE WAS NO INFANT IN THE CHURCH AT CORINTH.

I am aware that for one generation, 1. Cor. vii. 14, was considered the strong argument for infant baptism, but latterly a pure and honest criticism, even on the part of Pedobaptist commentators has exploded it.

I will quote a few.

LUTZ.—"If Paul had only thought of infant baptism, he could not possibly have spoken thus."—In Stier's *Words*, etc., vol. iii, p. 329, Clark's Edition.

OLSHAUSEN.—"It is moreover clear that St. Paul could not have chosen this line of argument, had infant baptism been at that time practiced."—*Com.* on 1 Cor. vii, 14.

NEANDER, speaking of the distinction between the children here mentioned and the children of heathens, and of their being "considered in a certain sense as belonging to the church," immediately adds: "But this is not deduced from their having partaken of baptism, and this mode of connection with the church is rather evidence against the existence of Infant Baptism," [*His of Plan.*, etc., vol. i, p, 165. Bohn's Edi.]—He

teaches that this passage "testifies against the existence of infant baptism" when Paul wrote; that if infant baptism had then existed, the epithet *hagia*, which in contrast with *akatharta* is applied to these children," would have been deduced only from the sacred rite."

DR. A. BARNES.—"This passage has been often interpreted, and is often adduced to prove that children are 'federally holy,' and that they are entitled to Christian baptism on the ground of the faith of one of their parents. But against this interpretation there are insuperable objections. 1, The phrase, 'federally holy,' is unintelligible, and conveys no idea to the great mass of men. It occurs nowhere in the Scriptures; and what can be meant by it? 2, It does not accord with the scope and design of the argument. There is not one word about baptism here, not one allusion to it; nor does the argument in the remotest degree bear upon it."

Paul's argument, in a few words is this:—if the intercourse of a believing wife with an unbelieving husband was so improper as that she must separate from him, then all of you would have to separate from all your children, for they stand in the same relation to you—unregenerate—unbaptized.

If there is any doubt about it, notice how Paul addresses the Church, I Cor. i. 2, as a body of persons, "Sanctified in Christ Jesus," "called Saints." Of them Paul says:

I Cor. i. 4 I thank my God always on your behalf, for the Grace of God which is given you by Jesus Christ; 5 That in every thing ye are enriched by him, in all utterance, and in all knowledge; 6 Even as the testimony of Christ was confirmed in you: 7 So that ye come behind in no gift; waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ: 8 Who shall also confirm you unto the end, *that ye may be blameless* in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ." 9 God is faithful, by whom ye were called unto the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord.

This could not have been addressed to any Methodist Society on earth—only to a church composed of professed Christians. If any proof is wanting, chapter xiii. 13 will conclude it.

"For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, *whether we be* Jews or Gentiles, *whether we be* bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.

Now in verses 27 and 28 we learn that this body is the visible church of Christ on earth, and it will be confessed that it cannot be said of infants, that *in the same spirit* as the believing adult they are baptized *into* the church, i. e., added to it, and my opponent, mark you, wont admit that there is a living infant on earth a member of a Methodist Society—nor can it be said that infants as such have been made to drink into the same spirit, with believing adults—for they have no volition, they cannot, spiritually, drink in anything.

THERE WERE NO INFANTS IN ALL THE CHURCHES OF GALATIA.

Every member of these Churches who had been baptized, had been baptized into Christ and had put on Christ. Paul especially declares this in these words.

Gal. iii. 27 For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. 28 There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. 29 And if ye *be* Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise.

Each one of them all when baptized had openly professed to be united with Christ by faith—further, the force of the phrase “baptized *into* Christ” denotes, that each one had put on Christ, i. e., professedly declared themselves to be the disciples of Christ, and because Christ's, then Abraham's seed, *spiritual*, and heirs. Now no living infant was ever or can be Abraham's Spiritual Seed, for to become thus, they must be the Children of God by faith in Christ, Gal. iii. 26, that, no living infant ever did or can exercise, for “they that are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God,” Rom. ix. 8.

I am willing for Eld. Ditzler's own witnesses to testify if I am right in this.

CALVIN.—“He uses the similitude of a robe when he says, that the Galatians have put on Christ; but he means that they were so grafted into Christ, that before God they bore the name and person of Christ, and were reckoned more in Him than in themselves.

DR. DODDRIDGE.—“For so many of you as have been baptized into Christ; and so have taken upon you the solemn profession of His religion, these may be said to have put on Christ, to be clothed with His character, and covered with His righteousness.”—*Com. on Gal. iii, 27.*

R. BAXTER.—“For as many of you as have sincerely consented to the baptismal covenant, and so been baptized into the faith of Christ, and relation to Him, have thereby even put Him on as your garment, and wholly given up yourselves to Him, and so, as His members, are united to Him. And all that are baptized have professed this; which the sincere perform” (*Para. on Gal. iii, 27.*)

DR. MACKNIGHT.—“As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have thereby professed that ye have put on the very temper and virtues of Christ.” (*Com. on Gal. iii, 27.*) “To put on Christ, is to follow His doctrine, precepts, and example.”—*Com. on Rom. xiii, 14*

J. WESLEY.—“For as many of you as have testified your faith by being baptized in the name of Christ, have put on Christ—have received Him as your righteousness, and are therefore sons of God through Him.”

DR. A. CLARKE—"As many of you as have been baptized into Christ. All of you who have believed in Christ as the promised Messiah, and received baptism as a public proof that ye had received Christ as your Lord and Savior, have put on Christ." "To be put on or to be clothed with one, is to assume the person and character of that one." "The profession of Christianity is an assumption of the character of Christ." *Com. on Gal. iii, 27*). "Putting on, or being clothed with Jesus Christ," says he, "signifies receiving and believing the gospel, and consequently taking its maxims for the government of life, having the mind that was in Christ."—*Com. on Rom. xiii, 14*.

M. HENRY.—"This faith in Christ whereby they became the children of God, he acquaints us, verse 27, was what they professed in baptism; for, he adds, *As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ*; having in baptism professed their faith in Him, they were thereby devoted to Him, and had, as it were, put on His livery and declared themselves His servants and disciples." "In our baptism we put on Christ, because we profess our discipleship to Him."—*Com. on Gall. iii, 27*.

Refutation.

ARG. XXXIV. (1). Paul shunned not to declare the whole counsel of God to the Church at Ephesus.

(2). He did not declare Infant Baptism to be required of God as a religious service or parental duty.

(3). Therefore Infant Baptism is not according to the counsel or ordination of God.

ARG. XXXV. (1). If none were baptized during the Apostles, ministry but such as were baptized *into Christ and thereby "put on Christ,"* i. e., took upon themselves, voluntarily the entire and sole jurisdiction of Christ—then infants should not be baptized for they have no faith and can make no profession, and whatever others may do, is no act of obedience on *their* part.

(2). But none were baptized by the apostles, but such as were baptized to put on Christ, etc.

Gal. iii. 27, For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.

(3). Therefore Infants should not be baptized.

ARG. XXXVI. (1). None but persons, which means accountable beings, are commanded to be baptized by Christ, or authorized to be by His Word

(2) Elder Ditzler admits that infants are not persons, and all know that they are not accountable beings.

(3) Therefore Infant Baptism is not authorized by the Word of God.

ARG. XXXVII. (1) A baptism, that is not the baptism of repentance unto the remission of sins, cannot be called Christian baptism.

(2) The baptism of an unconscious babe is manifestly not the baptism, etc.

(3). Therefore, infant baptism cannot be called Christian baptism.

DR. DITZLER'S TENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—It may be proper for me to guard against any misunderstanding as to what was agreed to between Doctor Graves and myself on covenants. He clearly saw, I presume, that we essentially agreed on the fact that salvation is only through the Abrahamic covenant. We differ as to the Jewish church, he, as I understand him, assuming that it was founded on the Sinaitic covenant, whereas I contend it developed out of, and rested on, the covenant of redemption made with our fathers after the fall, and renewed to Abraham, ratified and completed on the cross. As men's minds get confused on the different covenants, I prefer always holding the mind to the *Oneness* of the church, in the way we have already argued it.

Doctor Graves addressed me a letter proposing that we do not discuss the covenants, and we readily assented thereto. Our views have gone to record.

Doctor Graves says in Acts, in all cases, faith and baptism went together. Suppose it was so—

1. It does not prove that the faith was in each case that of the individuals baptized: for only Lydia's faith is named—her household is baptized. That is exactly as it had always been among the Jews. Only the Jailor is said to have believed—yet "all his house" was baptized. Only Stephanas believed—his household was baptized. But he says "the Jailor believed—all his house believed."

We beg to remind him that we only have his very bold assertion for all that. "He rejoiced, believing in God, (*panoiki*) with all his house."

We must remind the Doctor that *believe* is in the singular as well as rejoice, in the Greek—only the *Jailor* believed so far as the record declares—only he rejoiced. The word *panoiki* is purely an *adverb* qualifying *rejoiced*. Yet out of this ad-

verb—one simple word in Greek, we get the four in English—“with all his house,” and used as if they all believed and rejoiced. Not a word of it.

He feels the force of the eight household baptisms of the New Testament and seeks to break their force by denying there were infants in any of them.

1. We hardly believe it would be safe to start up any street in this city and bet heavily that there were no infants in the first eight households you came to, even taking the row where the Baptist preacher lives.

The old Syriac, made in Apostolic times gives additional force to it, by rendering it “Lydia and her children”—“Jailor and all his children.” It being made in that age tells us the very thing that is denied—all the children of the house were baptized.

He tells us the symbolism of baptism is against infant baptism. Here he assumes its symbolism to be 1, What it never had been for 1500 years, as he will admit. 2. What it could not have been in John’s day—no such use then, he will admit, not being named. 3. What it was not in Christ’s day—and which he does not pretend to find a word supporting till some sixteen years after Pentecost. In Romans vi. 4, he assumes it is symbolic of death, burial and resurrection.

But 4. There is no proof of it there or anywhere. Such is the futility of his objection on the score of symbolism. On the contrary, no party so perfectly answers the true import of baptism as infants.

The Doctor urges that those who could read are the parties addressed. And has it come to this? An Epistle is addressed to a church—it implies in his estimation that all its members read it. Were not the prophets read to the church—in the congregations in synagogues in the Jewish church?

The terms *we*, *you*, *ye*, *they*, were all used, yet no one infers therefrom that infants were not in the church then, because they could not read. Common sense was exercised then as now in all such matters. When Paul tells us that those who do not work shall not eat—or Moses—“in the sweat of our face

we are to eat bread all our days"—it does not imply that infants are to be starved.

As to all his authorities quoted and talked of, nine-tenths of them believe it refers to Proselyte baptism—an opinion he repudiated, and thus non-suits himself. He cannot take a matter, in itself wholly in doubt among all commentators, as a proof on another matter in dispute.

In Corinthians and Ephesians God's church is addressed as "saints," etc. These terms, he urges, cannot be applied to infants. Therefore, they are not members of the church. Now, 1. 1 Cor. vii. 14, children—including all—are called "saints" in the Greek—"But now are they—your children—holy"—saints in Greek. 2. In the Old Testament the people of God are constantly called saints—called on to laud, and praise God. Yet all admit infants were in the church—all of them then. If these terms so often applied to a church full of infants, how could their continued use imply their rejection?

He quotes a number of passages where adults are implied as the actors and speakers—Heb. x. 22. "Let us draw near," etc. 1. Pet. i. 3—"Hath begotten us. "The church is "a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people," etc. 1 Pet. But we reply that all these things, or the same class of things are said of the church or its members in the Old Testament. The very words of Peter are quoted from the Pentateuch of Moses. Yet it is one of the strongest of the kind he cites in the New Testament. For example—"Let all the people praise thee"—"Let all the house of Israel know." "Come, let us reason together." "How is the faithful city become a harlot!" "These dry bones are the whole house of Israel." Yet infants were in the church thus addressed. Hence all these objections fall in a body to the ground.

The Doctor quotes 1. Pet. iii. 21, "baptism is the answer of a good conscience! He then asks if a babe has a good conscience. He certainly knows that the word "answer" in Greek—*eperataëma* means a "promise, a pledge, a stipulation—obligation—any of these previously given." Thus baptism administered to infants is a stipulation, "a

pledge in advance," so the word is used, as Schleusner, Wahl, and Suicer define and show. Hence there is nothing in this text against infant baptism.

Now had the gentleman wished to meet the issue as such a matter ought to be met, surely he could have laid out some great fundamental principle and stood by it, and "fought it out on that line." Surely if the New Testament had revealed a religion or brought before us a new church of the bold and radically different principles he contends for—if a new church had risen up of such superior claims over the old, strange it is he is compelled to rely on the merest incidental remarks of a speaker here, and a writer there, to discover so great and momentous an event.

When so able, so distinguished and capable a controversialist as Doctor Graves—the Ajax and the Mentor of the Baptists South and West has to rely on such points, it shows how solid and right—how perfectly Scriptural is our position. Meantime the Doctor raves terribly—he is dreadfully excited. Well he might be!

He again reads our Discipline, and quotes Watson and Wesley, then puts a construction upon them neither they nor our people ever thought of or intended, as he well knows. Though I object to some of the phrases in our ritual, because of the liability to misconstruction and perversion, yet the meaning intended is clearly pointed out, in view of our general teaching from our rise till today. Methodistic doctrine never has called for modification and change like that of the Baptist church. By "being delivered from thy wrath," is not meant that there he is so delivered is plain from all we teach. We mean he is already by virtue of atonement passed into a state of favor with God, when born he is born under the full provisions of a merciful government. "The free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." See Romans v, in full. The prayer he makes such an ado over shows by its wording that he misconstrues it all. You read there such phrases as these—of the infant—"that he [or she] being steadfast in faith, joyful through hope, and rooted in love." Who believes all this is in infancy, or takes place in the act

of baptizing him? Dr. Graves pretends that we hold it thus to occur! It reads on, "may so pass the waves of this troublesome world," etc. Is that all during baptism? The preacher prays "that all carnal affections may die in him, and that all things belonging to the Spirit may live and grow in him. Grant that he may have power and strength to have victory, and to triumph against the devil, the world and the flesh." So it goes. Does not all this show what we mean, that we pray for the entire future life of the child? Yet Dr. Graves and our foes give all this the opposite meaning! How unbecoming, how ungenerous, and how astonishing such a course! The address to the parents still more clearly exhibits the same facts. They are "to teach" the child "to renounce the devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same," etc., etc. Would learned men among us thus speak of infants as such? Notice, the heading of all this reads, "the minister shall use the following, *or some other suitable exhortation.*" Dr. Graves tried to impress you with the idea that such form is imperative!! Yet the Discipline he held had that right before his eyes!

We have now answered all that the capacity of our opponents can urge against our cause on the point where they consider us more vulnerable than anywhere else. Instead of crippling or weakening our arguments, we are free to confess, we feel far more confident in them, more secure than ever before; for, being sifted by the shrewdest minds, and tested by the severest forces that can possibly be brought against them, when we see such arguments as the best that can be brought, it increases our confidence in the truth. I confess to you that when I saw Dr. Graves' publication last August, on this question, I presumed he would bring to bear upon it a force—that such would be the fury of his onset and keenness of his lance, that like a watchful general, I went out on an unusually close inspection, pryed closely into every point in my fortifications, threw up some new earthworks, placed several commanding batteries in position, so as to sweep every part of the field, and then I felt—let him come on. Not a

point can he attack, not a parapet can he pass over. And¹ so it has resulted. Our Bible argument we need not re-notice. It is complete. It need not now be restated.

We showed that proselyte baptism existed from Moses onward always. Hence,

1. All infants of Jews were baptized.
2. The infants of all proselyted Gentiles were always proselyted—brought in with their parents into the organized fellowship of the Jewish church.

3. All the infant children of all proselyted Gentiles were always baptized from the days of Moses onward till the commission was given. Hence, under the circumstances the commission was as much of a command to baptize infants as it was to baptize adults, as the learned and clear-headed philosopher of the *Southern Review*, Dr. A. T. Bledsoe, tells us. There are set no limitations, no qualifications that exclude infants. It was at the end of three years, six months' labor to reform and spiritualize, confirm, strengthen and elevate the life of the church. In this renovated condition it is a good "stock," a "good olive tree" to bear the engrafted Gentiles. Bring them in also. So he had taught "Other sheep, I have, which are not of this fold, the church—Acts xx, 28, 29, them I must bring in also, and there shall be one fold and one Shepherd." John x, 16. Into it Christ is the door. He did not destroy the fold, expel those within, or make a new fold, but brought Gentiles into the fold.

We appealed to history. In the years 251–3, we saw sixty-six bishops of the most intellectual part of the earth at that period deciding that it was not necessary to wait till a babe was eight days old to baptize it. The decision was unanimous. Those bishops—the great body of them were preachers and vigorous men, when Tertullian and Origen yet lived. and of the same country, the same districts. It did not come into practice as an innovation then, between Tertullian and these bishops, most of whom went through fearful fires of persecution in their lives. It is preposterous to suppose that any part of the church failed to baptize them; for had a part not done so, such a decision could not have been so promptly

reached, being unanimous. It is unusual to have on great questions, such a decision, never one a new one. Every charge introduced produced great agitation and schisms.

Nothing of the kind occurs as to baptism of infants. Tertullian's opposition shows it to have been unanimous in his day—A. D. 190. 1. The parties baptized in his day are of "innocent age." They are too young to be personally guilty. Hence "infants" in Bible language in the true sense of the word. They were too young to know what it was to be baptized. Hence "infants"—*parvuli*—little children. They were too young to manifest what would be their disposition of mind—too young to "learn"—hence *infants* of tenderest age. Such are a few of the many attributes of infancy Tertullian attributes to those baptized in his day. A. Campbell is honest enough always to call them infants, but such utter perverters of all historic truth as Orchard and that class, have even dared to assert that Tertullian is talking about minors simply!

Strange then if at that day the church was only in small part baptizing minors, people 18, 16, and 15 years old! for Baptists tell us it began to be mooted in Tertullian's day whether or not minors should have baptism, etc.!'

Had a goodly part of the church not baptized infants Tertullian being a shrewd lawyer, a scholar, and rhetorician, would have allied himself with that party. He finds no such party. He would have appealed to the old ministers and members yet living who were born, some in John's day—others a few years later—bosom friends of the immediate disciples of the Apostles, and learned from them the real facts. Infant baptism was universal in Tertullian's day. Irenæus, born before John died, from best information we can get, the bosom companion of Polycarp, John's disciple and bishop of Smyrna, refers to baptism as often fathers of that day did, under "regenerated to God," and names infants first—"infantes." As all must see, if infant baptism was not Apostolic, but a later innovation, it implied two things—1. Entire change of the doctrine of the church, if Baptist principles are to be presumed. 2. A radical change in the practice of the church. The writings of a swarm of most pious and learned men came down

to us filling up the entire period between the Apostles and the days of the 66 bishops named. The whole mass of literature is as silent as the grave on any such change. We gave full historic quotations in our speech on the historic aspect of this question—seventh, I believe and need not repeat it here.—[*Time out.*

DR. GRAVES' TENTH REPLY.

MR. PRESIDENT.—I wish at the out-start to call your attention to the evasive statement of Elder Ditzler as he commenced his last speech, and I frankly express my astonishment! It was Elder Ditzler who privately suggested to me as I was rising to deliver my seventh speech that we discuss the Covenants no longer. I replied they are your stronghold, and I am going to thoroughly examine them, as we agreed to do. He replied I am willing to concede that they furnish no ground for infant baptism. I said if you will rise and state that to the congregation I will consent to discuss them no more.

Elder Ditzler did rise and did state openly and frankly that he conceded that the old Covenants, afforded no ground for Infant Baptism and we had mutually agreed to discuss them no more. I repeated his confession word for word as it stands in the record uncorrected by him or the Moderators, and upon that closed the Old Testament and opened the New and the Old Testament Covenant, made with Abraham or Moses we have from that hour discussed no more. This audience knows I have stated the facts in the case. Does Elder Ditzler wish at this late hour in the discussion of this proposition to go back on his word and honor, and seek to evade the force of that concession?

I do not agree with him that the Covenant of Redemption was made with our first parents after the fall. I showed him that what he called that Covenant was made with Satan and not with Adam or Eve! I do not agree with him that the Covenant of Redemption was made with Abraham or any of the fathers or with any *mortal* being, but the Father made it with his chosen One, the Son, before the foundation of the world, and Christ stood surety to the Father for his people, while Elder Ditzler declares it was made by God, the Father

with Abraham, and Christ stood surety to Abraham for his Father !!

No Sir, from his open surrender of the Old Covenants as a ground of Infant Baptism he cannot escape now from his terrible position—touching the Covenant of Redemption made first in the garden—and if so with Satan, and then with Abraham.

The letter I addressed to him was *after* he had surrendered the Covenants, and contained a suggestion based upon that fact !! The letter is here to speak for itself, and the brethren who bore it! What am I to think of this?

PROSELYTE BAPTISM.

Since my mere reference to authorities touching the groundlessness of any argument for Infant Baptism based on Proselyte Baptism is treated so lightly by my opponent, I will put their very words in proof here. I will quote from the highest Pedobaptist authorities who have written upon this question.

“Dr. P. Fairbairn, already quoted referring to the idea of Jewish proselyte baptism as existing before the time of Christ, an idea generally entertained in Dr. Wall’s time, says; “Later and more discriminating investigations, however, have shown this view to be untenable.” He says that “there is no evidence of a Jewish proselyte baptism till about the fourth century of the Christian era.” “So far, therefore,” says he, “as regards the institutions of the Old Covenant, and the Scriptures of that covenant, a small approach only is made toward that state of things which meets us at the gospel era, when the fore-runner of our Lord came forth with a specific ordinance of baptism, as an initiatory rite to be administered to all who listened to his word; and at a later period the apostles received through such an ordinance all believers into the church of Christ.” (*Imp. Bib. Dic. Art. Bap.*) In his *Hermeneutical Manual*, he says, “So far as the direct evidence goes, the very utmost that can be said is, that indications appear of Jewish proselyte baptism as an existing practice during the fourth century of the Christian era. And as there is no historical ground for supposing it to have been then originated, it may, with some probability, be held to have been commonly in operation for a certain time previously. But if we inquire *when*, or *how*, we can find no satisfactory answer, all is involved in uncertainty.”—p. 275.

“Dr. E. De Pressense (Presby.) thus writes: “Considered from an apostolic point of view, baptism would be allied neither to circumcision, nor to the baptism which was administered to proselytes under Judaism. There is between it and circumcision all the difference which exists between the theocracy into which one enters by birth, and the church into which one en-

ters by conversion. It is in direct connexion with faith; that is to say, with the most free and the most individual act of the human soul.

As to the baptism administered to Jewish proselytes, it accompanied circumcision, and had the same signification. It washed the neophyte and his family from the filth of paganism, and indicated his incorporation and that of his children into the Jewish theocracy; its character was essentially national and theocratic. Christian baptism does not transmit itself by right of inheritance any more than faith. This is the grand reason that makes us believe that in the apostolic age it was not administered to infants. We cannot quote any positive fact in the New Testament that proves infant baptism: the historic proofs that have been alleged are insufficient. There is only one doubtful case; and those who attach more importance to the general spirit of the New Testament than to an isolated text, do not hesitate to contest all its worth. Besides, if we must confess that the baptism of infants began to invade the church in the second century, the principal idea of baptism still clings to it in all its essential elements. The rule is to require a living faith of those who demand it: it is surrounded with solemn guarantees; it is prefaced by three years of instruction; and it is administered only after multiplied and vigorous proofs. "The baptism of infants, far from being traced back to the apostles, is an innovation which coincides with the prevalence of Episcopal notions."

Dr. Lardner.—"As for the baptism of Jewish proselytes, I take it to be a mere fiction of the rabbis." "A Jewish rite," says Mr. Booth, "respecting which the Bible is profoundly silent, becomes the pedestal for a Christian ceremony; and one presumption is erected upon another."

Prof. M. Stuart.—"We are destitute of any early testimony to the practice of proselyte baptism, antecedently to the Christian era. The original institution of admitting Jews to the covenant, and strangers to the same, prescribed no other rite than that of circumcision. No account of any other is found in the Old Testament; none in the Apocrypha, New Testament, Targums of Onkelos, Jonathan, Joseph the Blind, or in the work of any other Targumist, excepting Pseudo-Jonathan, whose work belongs to the seventh or eighth century. No evidence is found in Philo, Josephus, or any of the earlier Christian writers. How could an allusion to such a rite have escaped them all, if it were as common, and as much required by usage as circumcision?"

Dr. J. Bennett says: "The Talmud is so replete with folly and filth, that a Jewish education enfeebles, distorts, and pollutes the mind" (*Cong. Lec.*, vol. viii, p. 238). Yet from a knowledge of such "folly and filth" we are to learn what is Christian baptism!

"Dr. Kitto, on proselyte baptism as existing before John's, and John's being derived from it, says: "This opinion is not at all tenable; for as an act which strictly gives *validity* to the admission of a proselyte, and is no mere *accompaniment* to his admission, baptism certainly is not alluded to in the New Testament; while, as to the passages quoted in proof from the classical (profane) writers of that period, they are all open to the most fun-

damental objections. Nor is the utter silence of Josephus and Philo on the subject a less weighty argument against this view. It is true that mention is made in the Talmud of that regulation as already existing in the first century; but such statements belong only to the traditions of the Gemara, and require careful investigation before they can serve as proper authority" (*Cy. Art. Bap.*)

I will now continue my examination of New Testament Churches.

THERE WERE NO INFANTS IN THE CHURCH AT EPHESUS.

In Paul's letter to this church, he addressed them as a body of Saints and faithful in Christ Jesus, who had been blessed with all spiritual blessings in heavenly things in Christ,—as a company of persons who had been chosen before the foundation of the world to holiness and blamelessness in love, and predestinated into the adoption of children by Jesus Christ, not through goodness foreseen, but according "to the promise of the glory of His grace," wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved. I will read a few sentences from the address of Paul to them:

"In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace; wherein he hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence; having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself: That in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; *even* in him: In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will; that we should be to the praise of his glory, who first trusted in Christ. In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation; in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory.—Eph. i, 7-14.

No one who respects the divine record, can doubt that this was a church of professed believers—those who had heard and believed, and been sealed by the Holy Spirit. This certainly was not a church—a society like any one Eld. Ditzler can find in the Old Testament—composed principally of infants and unregenerate men, but a model of the spiritual church of Christ, built up of living, precious stones. Let the inquirer read the whole epistle, and he will see that it forbids the idea of infants being members of it.

THERE WERE NO INFANTS IN THE CHURCH AT COLOSSE.

Paul addressed this church as a body of persons who without exception, though once alienated and enemies, as then reconciled—and made complete in Christ.

“In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ.” “Buried with *him* in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with *him* through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.” “And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses.” “Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross.” Col. ii. 11-14.

If the members of this church had been baptized, and every one of them had been buried in their baptism—they had also been raised up with Christ through faith—which cannot be said of an infant. They were indeed a body of “faithful men” who were dead to sin, and their lives hid with Christ in God.

For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God.” Col. iii. 3.

There were indeed children in this church, but they were old enough to be addressed thus.

“20. Children, obey *your* parents in all things: for this is well pleasing unto the Lord.”

THERE WERE NO INFANTS IN THE CHURCHES ADDRESSED BY THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

(1). *They are addressed throughout as holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, and not of those who drew back unto perdition, but who had believed unto the saving of their souls.*” Heb. x, 39. This certainly was a church of professed Christians! They are addressed as, “*brethren*,” they had therefore publicly associated themselves as members with the church by baptism. No Evangelist or Apostle ever addressed any unbaptized person as, “*brother*,” nor should we. It implies a member of the same family, fraternity or organization. A Mason does not address an Odd Fellow as “*brother*” for the very good reason he don’t belong to the same fraternity. I do not address my opponent as brother for he has never been baptized, he does not belong to the same visible family or fraternity with myself.

2. *They had all made a public profession of their faith.*

Mark the apostle's exhortation to them: "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water." "Let us hold fast the profession of *our* faith without wavering; for he *is* faithful that promised; "And let us consider one another to provoke unto love and to good works: "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some *is*; but exhorting *one another*: and so much the more, as ye see the day approaching."—Heb. x. 22-25.

These Jewish Christians well understood the type—the cleansing of a leper under the law. They knew that blood was always before water. When found to be healed he was first sprinkled by the priest with the blood of the slain bird, mingled with spring water, and then before he was allowed to come into the congregation of Israel, he must bathe, immerse his body in water. And this last act was a profession that he was clean and fit to unite with the congregation. So says the apostle to these Christian Jews, having had our hearts sprinkled with the blood of Christ, of which that blood was a type, and our bodies immersed in pure water, let us hold fast the profession of our faith, clearly indicating that the immersion of the body in pure water was a profession of faith.

3. *The primitive Jewish churches were wholly composed of professedly "first born" ones whose names were registered in the Book of Life.*

I have explained this passage at length in a former speech, and given A. Clarke's full comment, and to that I refer all. It is conclusive beyond a question.

I would here call attention to the testimony of the following distinguished Pedobaptist authorities regarding the import of the foregoing citations from the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Abp. TILLOTSON—"This refers to that solemn profession of faith which was made by all believers at their baptism."—Works, vol. iv. p. 865.

Dr. DODDRIDGE—"Our bodies in baptism washed in pure water, intended to represent our being cleansed from sin."—Para. on Heb. x. 32.

Dr. BLOOMFIELD—"The full sense, imperfectly developed, is, 'Let us hold fast unflinchingly the faith we confessed [in baptism], and cling to the hope involved in that profession.'"—Gr. Tes. Sup. vol. on Heb. x. 23.

I have one more—concluding and conclusive—argument to

offer in proof, that infant membership is not warranted by the New Testament.

THERE WERE NO INFANTS AMONG ALL THE JEWISH CHURCHES, ADDRESSED BY PETER IN HIS TWO GENERAL EPISTLES.

He addressed two epistles to Christian Jews, members of churches, because they had been baptized, throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia—including the church in Babylon, members of these. Peter tells the churches what baptism was to each one of them, the *answer of a good conscience towards God*—1 Peter, iii. 20. What this means, I prefer to have Pedobaptist scholars, including Jno. Wesley and R. Watson to testify, for surely my opponent will not gainsay them all.

J. WESLEY—"Through the water of baptism we are saved from the sin which overwhelms the world as a flood; not indeed the bare outward sign but the inward grace: a *Divine consciousness*, that both our persons and our actions are accepted through Him who died and rose again for us" (Notes on N. T. on 1 Pe. iii. 21)—Can Christian baptism according to these writers be other than believers' baptism?

R. WATSON—"Now, whether we take the word *eperotema*, rendered in our translation 'answer,' for a demand or requirement; or for the answer to a question or questions; or in the sense of stipulation: the general import of the passage is nearly the same. If the first, then the meaning of the apostle is, that baptism is not the putting away the filth of the flesh, not a mere external ceremony; but a right which requires or demands something of us, in order to the attainment of a good conscience. What that is, we learn from the words of our Lord; *it is faith in Christ*.—"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved;" which faith is the reliance of a penitent upon the atonement of the Savior, who thus submits with all gratitude and truth to the terms of the evangelical covenant" (Theol. Ins. vol. iv. p. 407). Again, "St. Peter preserves the correspondence between the act of Noah in *preparing the Ark as an act of faith* by which he was justified, and the act of submitting to Christian baptism, which is also obviously *an act of faith*" (p. 409).

There could have been no infants in any one of all these churches—they were Baptist churches, one and all.

I now sum up my second argument from apostolic teachings and practice. I have shown conclusively and proved, by a host of Pedobaptist scholars and commentators, that the baptism of an infant *effectually destroys the symbolism of baptism*, and renders it, not only a meaningless ceremony, but makes it

misstate the truth—teach positive falsehoods—and that it destroys the perpetual analogy of Christian baptism. It, therefore, cannot be authorized, but is forbidden by the teachings of all the apostles.

I have shown that it was not known by the churches planted or addressed by the apostles, and specifically, that there could have been none in the following churches—*i. e.*, Jerusalem, Samaria, Rome, Ephesus, Colosse, Corinth, Babylon, nor in any of the churches in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Bithynia, nor in *all Asia, nor in any church composed of Jews, in any part of the world.* If not in churches composed of Jews, then where need we look for it?

I have thus placed before you the teachings of the New Testament, and by showing what these are, have successfully met all his arguments drawn from them. I have demonstrated that it was neither authorized by Christ, enjoined by the apostles, nor practiced by any apostolic church. That it arose in the second century after Christ, with the doctrine of *baptismal regeneration* and a host of other dogmas and traditions, I am free to admit. The first person to mention it was *Tertullian, A. D. 150, and he opposed it.* The proposition calls upon Eld. Ditzler to prove that Infant Baptism is authorized by the Word of God—not that it was practiced by a corrupt section of the professed church in early times. I now wish to introduce
THE TESTIMONY OF THIRTY-SEVEN EMINENT PEDOBAPTISTS, HISTORIANS, CRITICS AND SCHOLARS.

I will introduce these with the recent statement of the ripest scholar and logician in my friends own church—the Carson of Methodists—Doctor A. T. Bledsoe, L L. D., editor of the Southern Review, published under the auspices of the Methodist Episcopal Christian Society.

“It is an article of our faith, that ‘the baptism of young children [infants] is in any wise to be retained in the Church, *as most agreeable to the institution of Christ.*’ But yet, with all our searching, we have been unable to find, in the New Testament, a single express declaration, or word, in favor of Infant Baptism. We justify the right, therefore, solely on the ground of logical inference, and not on any express word of Christ or his Apostles. This may, perhaps, be deemed, by some of our readers a strange position for a pedobaptist. It is by no means, however, a singu-

lar opinion. Hundreds of learned pædobaptists have come to the same conclusion; especially since the New Testament has been subjected to a closer, more conscientious, and more candid exegesis than was formerly practised by controversialists."

In Knapp's Theology, for example, it is said: 'There is no decisive example of this practice in the New Testament; for it may be objected against those passages where the baptism of the whole families is mentioned, viz:—Acts x. 42-48; xvi. 15-33; 1 Cor. i. 16, that it is doubtful whether there were any children in those families, and if there were, whether they were then baptized. From the passage, Matt. xxviii. 19, it does not necessarily follow that Christ commanded Infant Baptism (the *matheteuon* is neither for nor against); nor does this follow any more from John iii. 5, and Mark x. 14-16. There is, therefore, no express command for Infant Baptism found in the New Testament, as Morus (p. 215, § 12) justly concedes.' (Vol. ii. p. 524)."

Dr. Jacob also says, 'However reasonably we may be convinced that we find in the Christian Scriptures "the fundamental idea from which infant baptism was afterward developed," and by which it may now be justified, it ought to be distinctly acknowledged that it is not an apostolic ordinance.' (p. 271).

In like manner, or to the same effect, Neander says: 'Originally baptism was administered to adults; nor is the general spread of Infant Baptism at a later period any proof to the contrary: for even after Infant Baptism had been set forth as an Apostolic institution, its introduction into the general practice of the Church was but slow. Had it rested on apostolic authority, there would have been a difficulty in explaining its late approval, and that even in the third century it was opposed by at least one eminent Father of the Church.' (p. 229).

We quote this passage, not because its logic does, in every respect, carry conviction to our mind, but simply to show how completely *Neander concedes the point, that Infant Baptism is not an Apostolic ordinance.* We might, if necessary, adduce the admission of many other profoundly learned pædobaptists, that *their doctrine is not found in the New Testament, either in express terms, or by implication from any portion of its language.*" Southern Review. vol. 14, p. 334-225.

Let his declaration be put into capital letters—for it is all the authority for infant baptism any candid scholar will claim.

We justify the rite, therefore SOLELY ON THE GROUND OF LOGICAL INFERENCE."

LUTHER.—"It cannot be proved by the sacred Scripture that infant baptism was instituted by Christ."—In A. R.'s *Vanity of Inf. Bap.*, part ii, p. 8.

ERASMUS.—"Paul does not seem in Rom. vi, 4 to treat about infants.

* It was not yet the custom for infants to be baptized."—*Anno.* on Rom. v. 14.

CALVIN.—"Because Christ requires teaching before baptizing, and will

have believers only admitted to baptism, baptism does not seem to be rightly administered, except faith precede."—In Wallace on *Chr. Bap.* p. 52.

LIMBORCH.—"There is no express command for it in Scripture; nay, all those passages wherein baptism is commanded, do immediately relate to adult persons, since they are ordered to be instructed, and faith is prerequisite as a necessary qualification. * * * There is no instance that can be produced, from whence it may indisputably be inferred, that any child was baptized by the apostles."—*Com. Sys. of Div.*, b. v, c. xxii, § 2

BP. BURNET.—"There is no express precept, or rule, given in the New Testament for the baptism of infants."—*Expo. of 39 Art.* Art. xxvii.

STAPFERUS.—"There is not any express command in the Holy Scripture concerning the baptism of infants."—*Theol. Polem.*, cap. iii, § 1647.

T. FULLER.—"We do freely confess that there is neither express precept nor precedent in the New Testament, for the baptizing of infants."—*Infant's Advo.*, p. 71.

CAWDREY.—"The Scriptures are not clear, that infant baptism was an apostolic practice." "We have not in Scripture either precept or example of children baptized."—In Booth's *Pæd. Ex.*, vol. i, p. 306.

MAGDEBURG CENTURIATORS.—"Examples prove that adults, both Jews and Gentiles, were baptized. Concerning the baptism of infants, there are no examples of which we read."—Cent. i, l. ii, c. vi.

WITSIUS.—"We do not indeed deny that there is no express and special command of God, or of Christ, concerning infant baptism."—*Æcon.*, l. iv, ch. xvi, § 41.

HEIDEGGERUS.—"There be neither express precept nor example for infant baptism."—*Corp. Theol.*, l. xxv, § 55.

Archd. PALEY.—"At the time the Scriptures were written, none were baptized but converts."—*Ser. on 2 Pe.* iii, 15, 16.

Bp. STILLINGFLEET.—"Whether baptism shall be administered to infants, or no, is not set down in express words, but left to be gathered by analogy and consequences"—*Irenicum*. p. ii, c. iv, p. 178.

ŒCOLAMPADIUS.—"No passage in the holy Scripture has occurred to our observation as yet which as far as the slenderness of our capacity can discern, should persuade us to profess Pædobaptism."—In Booth's *Pæd. Ex.*, vol. i, p. 308.

CELLARIUS.—"Infant baptism is neither commanded in the sacred Scripture, nor is it confirmed by apostolic examples."—In Booth's *Pæd. Ex.*, p. 309.

DR. DWIGHT.—"In the Scriptures" "there is no instance in which it is declared, in so many terms, that infants were baptized."—*Sermon 157th*.

STAPHILUS.—"It is not expressed in holy Scripture that young children should be baptized."—In T. Lawson's *Baptismologia*, p. 115.

Bp. BARLOW.—"I do believe and know there is neither precept nor example in Scripture for Pædobaptism"—In Dr. Wallace's *Chr. Bap.* page 59.

DR. DODDRIDGE.—“We do not meet with any instance in the earliest primitive antiquity in which the baptism of any child of Christian parents, whether infant or adult, is expressly mentioned” (*Misc. Works*, p. p. 489)

M. MARTINDALE.—“There are no express examples in the New Testament of Christ and His apostles baptizing infants.”—*Bib. Dic. Art. Bap.*

P. EDWARDS.—“There is neither express precept nor example for infant baptism in the New Testament.”—*Can. Rea.*, p. 9.

M. POOLE.—“I cannot be of their mind who think that persons may be baptized before they be taught: we want precedents of any such baptism in Scripture.”—*Anno.*, on Matt xxviii, 19.

DR. BUNSEN.—“The Reformation accepted Pædobaptism, although its leaders were more or less aware that it was neither Scriptural nor apostolic.” Of things believed to be destitute of Divine authority, Dr. B. speaks as “no more scriptural than infant baptism is The gospel is silent upon the subject of the sprinkling of infants”—*Hypol.*, vol. ii, pp. 105, 226; vol. iii, p. 205.

DR. STARK.—“There is not a single example to be found in the New Testament where infants were baptized. In household baptisms there was always reference to the gospel’s having been received. The New Testament presents just as good ground for infant communion. Therefore learned men (such as Salmatias Arnold, Louis de Vives, Suicer, and W. Strabo) have regarded both infant baptism and infant communion as innovations introduced since the apostles’ times.”—*His. of Bap.*, p. 10.

DR. JACOBI.—“Infant baptism was established neither by Christ nor His apostles.”—Kitto’s *Cy. Art. Bap.*

DR. F. SCHLEIERMACHER.—“All traces of infant baptism which one will find in the New Testament, must first be put into it.”—*Chris. Theol.* p. 383.

RHEINARD, MORUS, and DODERLEIN, says Bretschneider, “affirm that infant baptism is not to be found in the Bible.”—*Theol.* vol. ii, p. 578.

KAISER declares: “Infant baptism was not an original institution of Christianity.”—*Bib. Theol.* vol. i p. 178.

PROF. HAHN.—“Baptism, according to its original design, can be given only to adults, who are capable of true knowledge, repentance and faith. There is not in the Scripture a sure example of infant baptism to be found, and we must concede that the numerous opposers of it cannot be contradicted on gospel grounds.”—*Theol.*, p. 556.

HAGENBACH, after maintaining that infant baptism had no existence in the earliest apostolic church, says: “The passages from Scripture which are thought to intimate that infant baptism had come into use in the primitive church, are doubtful and good for nothing, viz., Mark x, 14; Matt. xviii, 4, 6; Acts ii, 38, 39, 41; Acts x, 46; 1 Cor. i, 16; Col. ii 11, 12.”—*His. of Doc.* p. 210.

I have not time to follow my opponent into the history of that portion of the church that apostatized from the truth,

and multiplied traditions and practiced commandments of men—for the proposition before us, limits this discussion to the *Word of God*. But I will affirm this, that that portion of the church entitled to be called the “true witnesses,” never did practice either infant baptism nor sprinkling, and never symbolized with the Episcopacy, or the Papacy. Of the Baptists Sir Isaac Newton justly says: “They are the only denomination that never symbolized with the Papacy.”

I will affirm another fact that every student of history knows, that when you first meet with infant baptism, A. D. 150, you find it opposed, and you find springing up with it sponsors, god-fathers and god-mothers—and salt and chrism, and exorcism, and trine immersion, traditions all.

And I will state another significant fact. The corrupt and pernicious doctrine of baptismal regeneration—no salvation without baptism—originated the practice of infant baptism, and another fact, every sect that has practiced infant baptism, has done so, and now does so, in order to confer grace or salvation upon the infant, as their Rituals, one and all, show. The implication is, that without baptism, the soul of the infant is endangered or lost.

I will state another historical fact, admitted by Wall to be a fact, and a stunning fact against the apostolic origin, or that the practice of infant baptism was anything but general the first four or five centuries; and that fact is, that a large number of the most eminent church Fathers and writers, were not baptized in infancy—nor until they had made a personal profession of Christ, when it is known that their parents were Christians!

“I produce the following passages, quoted by Danvers, out of the *Magdeburg Centuriators*—authority that no scholar will question:

“Chrysostom saith that the time of conversion was *the only fit time for baptism.*”

Hugo Grotius testifies: “That Chrysostom was born of Christian parents and educated by Meletius, a bishop. Was not baptized till past twenty-one.” And Montfaucon further testifies:

“That his father’s name was Secundus, and his mother’s Anthusia, both Christians before John was born; and that John was twenty-eight years of age when he was baptized.”

Jerome saith, "That, in the Eastern Churches, the adults only were baptized." —*Epistle against the errors of John, of Jerusalem.*

Again, in his *Epistle to Pumachius*: "They are to be admitted to baptism to whom it doth properly belong, viz., those only who have been instructed in the faith."

But Jerome was not himself baptized until thirty years old. Erasmus, in *Vita Hieronymi*, testifies—"That Jerome, born in the city of Strydon, of Christian parents, and brought up in the Christian religion, was baptized at Rome, in the thirtieth year of his age."

Here is a list of the names: Basil, Chrysostom, Jerome, Theodore the Emperor, Gregory Nazianzen, Ambrose, Polycrates, Declaries, the Emperor Constantine, and many nobles, and even Austin himself, of the fifth century. In addition to these, Pancratius, Pontius, Nazarius, Tecla, Lui-gerus, Erasma Tusca—all offsprings of believers, and yet not baptized till aged."

Orchard pertinently remarks in a note upon this fact—"Since these names with others which could be recorded, are some of the most distinguished for respectability, in the annals of history, *one plain evidence* enforces itself upon our attention; that *Pedobaptism* was unknown among royalty, courtiers, and respectable persons in Europe, at the period of these eminent men's births."

This argument staggered Wall, and well it might. It, of itself, dissipated into thin air all his arguments and alleged historical evidences. He was forced to confess, in view of it as follows: "It seems to me that the instances which the Baptists give of persons not baptized in infancy, though born of Christian parents are not, if the matter of fact be true, so inconsiderable as this last plea [the sayings of the fathers] would represent. On the contrary, *the persons they mention are SO MANY AND SUCH NOTED PERSONS*, that (if they all be allowed) it is an argument that leaving children unbaptized was no unusual, but a frequent and ordinary thing; for, it is obvious to conclude, that if we can, in so remote an age, trace the practice of *so many* that did this, it is probable that a *great many more*, of whose birth and baptism we do not read, *did the like*. This I will own, that it seems to me the argument of greatest weight of any that is brought on the Baptist side in this dispute about antiquity."

Curcelleus, a Presbyterian, says:

"Pedobaptism was not known in the world the two first ages after Christ; in the third and fourth it was approved *by few*; at length, in the fifth and following ages, it began to obtain in divers places; and, therefore we (Pedobaptists) observe this rite, indeed, as an ancient custom, but not as an apostolic tradition. The custom of baptizing infants did not begin before the third age after Christ, and that there appears not the least foot-step of it for the first two centuries."

And if these crushing historical facts are not sufficient to settle this question in the mind of every candid Christian, I

might add the testimony of the Councils of the first six centuries. I have time to add a few :

"The Council of Elvira or Granada, A.D. 305, enjoins a delay of baptism, if the catechumeni act worldly; also adultery and intermarriages should be checked, and ministers of religion should not have strange women with them."

"The Council of Laodicea, A.D. 365, required notice from the person who intended to be baptized, and resolved all should be instructed before they received it; and determined that the baptized should rehearse the articles of the creed."

"The Council of Constantinople, A. D. 384, decreed that certain persons should remain a long time under Scriptural instruction before they receive baptism."

"The Council of Carthage, A. D. 397, in canon thirty-four, declares that sick persons shall be baptized, who can not answer any longer, when those who are by them testify that they desire it.' Again, those who have no testimonials, and do not remember that they were baptized shall be baptized anew."

Refutation.

ARG. XXXVIII. (1) That cannot be an institution of Christ, for which there is neither command nor example in all God's Word, nor promise to those who observe it, nor threatenings to those who neglect it.

(2) But Pedobaptists themselves assert that there is no command for, or example of it, and consequently there can be no promise to those who observe, or threatenings to those who neglect it.

(3) *Ergo*, the baptism of infants, unbelieving children, is no institution of Christ, and consequently must be a device of man, and to teach and practice it for a divine appointment must be a sin.

DILEMMA.—Christian Baptism is either a parental or a personal duty.

If it is a parental duty, it is not obligatory upon the child should the parents neglect it, and therefore to be baptized is not the duty of any living unbaptized adult on this earth—which is absurd. If it is a *personal* duty then, it is not the duty of any parent or priest to baptize an infant without its volition, choice—and it certainly cannot be obligatory upon any infant, which is destructive of the entire theory of Infant Baptism.

Perhaps Elder Ditzler would do his people a favor by getting out of this dilemma himself and teaching them the way out.

NOTE.—This is the letter referred to on page 772 :

(CARROLLTON, MO., Monday night.

ELDER J. DITZLER ;—

Dear Sir ;— As you decline to discuss the covenants in connection with this proposition, and as you do not ground Infant Baptism upon them, it is very well, and I shall not press it therefore. I propose we spend the day (Tuesday) upon it, and open on communion on Wednesday morning. Trusting this will be agreeable to your feeling, I am, yours truly
J. R. GRAVES.

DR. DITZLER'S ELEVENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS.—It is to be regretted that Dr. Graves reserved a number of things to this late hour, and for the first time introduces them when I have but the one-half hour speech, in which it is usual to give a condensed summing up of what has been stated. I shall have to briefly notice the new points he so late in the debate brings up, after virtually doing nothing the past entire four speeches. I pressed my main matter on his attention promptly and from my first speech, when I was in the negative, as the record will show.

He says the Apostles, etc., did not call people “brother” till baptized! Ananias said, “Brother Saul, the Lord Jesus who appeared unto thee, etc.,” Acts ix. He was afterwards baptized. So you see the Doctor’s hobbies wont do.

Panoiki—“with all his house” in our version is purely an adverb, and he knows it, and can do nothing but *qualify* another word—a verb, in this as in most cases. It tells how he rejoiced—amidst his whole house—rejoiced in his family. We have no English word that completely represents it in a brief way, hence the manner in which it is drawn out into four words, *one* in Greek.

He calls for an *express* command to baptize infants, and tells us Bledsoe, Knapp, etc., etc., admit there is no such express command. Knapp says no “decisive mention” of it, etc., etc. Is there any “*express* command” by Christ *to us—to any* sinner to-day to be baptized? Not a word of it! The express command is to the Apostles—go disciple—baptizing them.” Our submitting to baptism is a legitimate and just *inference*, but still it is solely on the grounds of *several inferences* that any of us is baptized. We infer 1. That the baptizer is legitimately commanded by the nature of the commission, and his relation to it as a preacher. 2. That as he is commanded to baptize, he could not do so and no such command could be given unless it contemplated our submission to it. So not only are

not infants expressly commanded, but adults are not. As to its not being mentioned, we met that with an overwhelming answer he can never meet on earth. As to Dr. Bledsoë, he expressly repeats that the commission, though it does not specify any class—men, women, boys, or children, or infants—*“it ordains infant baptism.”*

As to writers before named, not naming Proselyte baptism, we showed 1. The Bible is perfectly clear on that point. He has never even noticed in any way the array of facts we adduced. 2. Hosts of historians and writers who speak of Jews, of baptism, etc., when all agree Proselyte baptism was in practice, never mention it, and for the good reason, it had been practiced for centuries—since Moses—from the day it was introduced.

He tells us in a certain council all who were baptized said the Creed. This is Baptist history again, and Baptist interpretation. Why in his speech he put it in evidence that the statement is utterly untrue: for in several centuries he finds three or four men who were not baptized in infancy, one or the other of their parents being heathen, or another accident or circumstance intervening, and this in the fourth and fifth centuries. Not a word of proof exists that repeating the creed was a condition of baptism; same in adult cases.

Do you not see that the Doctor treats this question—meets questions of history just as he does the Bible, by taking some incidental remark or merest accident, or incident, unconnected with the surroundings that would throw light on the subject, and interprets history by such means? It is plain matter of history in Tertullian's day that the church baptized infants, to say the least. It was not named as restricted to any locality, part or section of the church. It was universal. In the same strain Cyprian records the facts—the council of sixty-six Bishops in North Africa, A. D. 251. In the same strain Origen records it while Tertullian expressly says—*“The church gives baptism to infants.”* It is not a part—a section—*“the Church.”* Here we see the whole body of the church is embraced. Now Dr. Graves seeks to avoid plain, simple, historic facts and statements of the most valuable writers—writers

who have transcribed the very copies of the Bible by which we vindicate the purity of our text, and yet to do this he relies on such unexplained, unsubstantial, accidental matters as he brought up! Is that the way to meet facts?

He then quotes Grotius, who was convicted by Wall of gross unfairness and garbling the text. He quotes Stanley, who is full of conceits and notions; and Suicer, who proves infant baptism to have been universal in the very centuries you name. Here are his works before us.

Pelagius, being born and raised in England, had never seen Tertullian's Works, for printing and steamboats, etc., were unknown then, and he had never learned of the momentary,—the spasmodic opposition of Tertullian. I cannot take up the points he raises on Pelagius' views, but simply say, they are wrong, and I will expose them in the fifth proposition, when this matter will come up again. As to Cardinal Hosius, sixteenth century, he did all he could to crush the Reformation, and the most effective method was to split up the Protestants. As the Anabaptists were the weaker party, mainly uneducated and extremely fanatical, he did and said all he could to inflame, arouse and encourage them to every conceit and excuse, that Protestantism might be disgraced and rulers encouraged to put it down as dangerous to law and authority. It is in vain you quote such testimony,—it is nothing.

We must now review our points as hurriedly as possible. We showed, elaborating all the points,

1. That there was the church of God—his own church—the offspring of his covenant of salvation.

As men are essentially and always the same, and need the same remedies, God is the same, we showed that the church is one and the same. It is one in its covenant, its Head, its aim, its principles. We quote Paul, Heb. ii, 12; xii, 24; Acts vii, 38, where the word, "the church" was applied to God's people in the wilderness, in David's day, and applied to the whole of God's people in all time from Abel till his time—looking on it all as a unity.

2. We analyzed it therefore, and found 1, the word church applied to all God's people of all times—embracing all in

heaven and earth. 2. It is applied to the whole of God's people on earth—invisible church. 3. It is applied to a local assembly of God's people who meet at a given place or places religiously. We gave details how all this came about and its force. 4. We next showed that this church was spiritual

This we proved by showing (1), that Christ was the only foundation, its faith, its spiritual meat and drink. (2) That its ordinances had a spiritual import—symbolizing the purity of the heart, Rom. ii, 28, 29; iv, 11; Col. ii, 11. (3) That the Gospel was preached to them—Heb, iv, 1-4; Gal. iii; Rom. ix, of which Isa. liii was a sample. (4) That they had rules for expelling unfaithful members as strictly laid down as we have now (5) That as then, so now, as now so then, the rules were sometimes faithfully executed and at times they were not. (6) Hence that as now, and as in apostolic times—Jude iv, 9; 1. Peter, ii; Gal. ii, 4; John iii, 9-11, so then, bad men got into the visible organizations and at times exercised a baneful influence.

5. We then showed that infants were in this church—recognized in its visible organizations, and received its ordinances—the main two ordinances were circumcision and baptism, and both were applied to infants. Infants were in the church. Our opponents stated this themselves, and the Bible was emphatic on it.

6. We then showed that promises of endless existence, increase, perpetuity with enlargement, endless increase—inheriting the Gentiles, were constantly given to this church. Whatever calamities might befall her, in the darkest hours these promises of future enlargement were given. They never were fulfilled in the ancient church prior to Christ. All agree here. They related to Christ's coming; all are agreed here. We know before Christ's death the fulness of the Gentiles never came in. They only came in as single proselytes and their families. Now all stand on a common level. Are these prophecies true or false? Israel was not to be destroyed, but to "*inherit*" the fulness of the Gentiles—they shall be *converted unto thee*" See Isaiah xlix entire.

7. Jesus came—lived a Jew, died a Jew, called Jews and on-

ly Jews to the ministry. Three and a half years he labored, reforming the people, uniting all their moral energies and forces. He teaches that there are other sheep not of this fold—they I must bring in also, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd, John x, 16. This is in perfect accord with all that we have said. He taught, also, that the Kingdom of Heaven—illustrated by a vineyard long leased out,—shall be taken from the Jews and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. Matt. xxi, 43. How could it be taken *from* them and they charged with guilt in not making a wise use of it, if they never had it? He never has touched these points. And he dare not introduce new matter by the rules of debate in his final negative.

Christ acts consistent throughout. He reforms, goes about doing good. He “repairs.” He “restores.” By rending the vail and giving the commission he lengthens the cords and strengthens the stakes. Paul, Eph. ii, 16–21 and Gal. iv entire, Roman xi. entire shows that the unbelieving Jews still clung to the mere outward form—the ritualistic forms of worship. Its law had been “added,” brought in” “till the times of reformation”—“made nothing perfect,” “waxed old,” “was unprofitable.” It was “removed,” “taken out of the way.” All this opened the way to the Gentiles, who “must be brought in.” Now take up the *actual* record of events and they all confirm and demonstrate this as the only true view. John the Baptist does not organize a church. This Dr. Graves admits. The people he baptizes do not receive the Spirit—no purging away of moral pollution. They are prepared simply to repent, and believe on the Messiah when he comes.

Jesus organized no church. All those whom he pardoned, blessed, remained in their respective synagogues, or churches local. Hence we see no new church organized. Christ remained forty days after the resurrection—no new church yet. On Pentecost we see these reformed, spiritual Jews, but no new church. Those who were converted on Pentecost and daily those times, were “added to the church”—“added to the Lord”—“*the Lord* added to the church”—not *men*.

As this is so important an issue, is it unreasonable in us to

demand fact—to require clear, scriptural statement for the leading points our opponents seek to prove, since we did so in *every point*. Not a thing is inference on our side. All is positive fact—Bible record. Let it be met by the same. We quoted Scriptures, New Testament mainly, to show 1. A church. 2. It was spiritual. 3. Its members assembling for religious acts constituted local congregations. 4. Infants were recognized in the church. 5. Prophecies of perpetuity given to inherit the Gentiles. If it ceased—if it perished, it never did inherit them, and prophecy all failed. He admitted John did not organize a church. We saw that Christ never organized a church in his day. Such were the records we gave you. We saw that 1. All Bible records thus tallied.

2. All Bible doctrine (1) Prophets (2) the sayings of Christ, John x. 16; Matt. xxi. 43 for example and (3) Paul, Gal. iv.; Rom. xi. 12, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21; Eph. ii. 16-21, iii. 6, agree that the unbelieving, rejecting Jews were rejected—“blinded,” “stumbled,” “fell away” “cut off,” “cast out,” and the Gentiles “brought in,” engrafted into the place made vacant by the outgoing Jews.

3. Reason confirms all this. It is a reproach to the Almighty to suppose that he was experimenting on his own policy, and required from four to six thousand years, according to different systems of chronology, to have a church. Nay, we showed that the very word church used by Paul and Christ was borrowed and quoted from the Old Testament Greek.

Now what does the learned Gentleman offer as an offset to all this? Let us deal in strictest fairness. He relied solely on filing objections to our position—with “syllogisms”—every one of which assumed as true the very thing denied and involved in the question, and assuming as untrue matters wholly involved in the proposition; e. g., he assumed that infant baptism was contrary to the teaching of the New Testament. Therefore, so and so! And that was his logic!

Then he appealed to us to find it expressly named that an infant was baptized in the New Testament. We demanded where it was expressly named that 1. John baptized a woman, 2, or had been baptized himself, or 3, where boys and girls—children were expressly named as baptized in the New Tes-

tament, though Baptists do baptize them even as young as ten, nine, and some eight years old. Yea, 4, let him find where the twelve Apostles were said to have been baptized, or 5, where they ever baptized anybody; or 6, where women took the Lord's supper, or 7, where Ananias was baptized, or 8, the seventy who preached, or 9, where the one hundred and twenty were baptized, or 10, where the great body of pious Jews on Pentecost—Acts xi. 5-11, were baptized, or 11, where the infants that during the whole of Apostolic times were circumcised, are anywhere expressly named—that is, the record given, or it named where any one of the tens of thousands who were circumcised, were said to be circumcised. He was dumb on it all.

Now if all these important baptisms are omitted, as he believes they are merely omitted to be named, how could we expect it to be recorded that the baptism of an infant, a thing as common as eating almost, should be specially recorded? Thus we see the most popular hobby against infant baptism utterly falls to the ground.

He then urges that Christ organized the church on the Mount—(Matt. v. vi. vii.) We asked for proof. It was not even named—attempted. 1 The word church does not occur in the sermon. It is not hinted. 2. He gives not a hint about organizing one. 3. To organize a church means a visible, local congregation, with officers, etc. Where were such appointed or elected? In a few hours all the parties are gone—and in a short time they are sent over Judea to preach. Where is the organized church? Why the word church was never used by Christ, so far as the record goes, but on two occasions in all his ministry, and the first naming of it is as late as Matt. xvi.

We called for explanation on the point from the Baptist standpoint—how it could be that John's baptism put no one into a church, and Christ without baptism did put them into the church, without any local congregation—composed only of preachers traveling about two by two, but he passes such objects in silence. And by such amazing absurdities and assumptions as these, the infants are to be rejected! These are the best arguments that can be brought!

As a leading opposition, he urged that the ancient church was founded on circumcision—hence a mere carnal, ecclesiastico—political institution—a commonwealth! But 1. We called for proof—none was adduced. 2. We demanded how the piety of Abel, the purity of Enoch, Elijah, the faith of Abraham, Moses, Samuel, the moral excellency and piety of Daniel, the Hebrew children, etc., all of whom lived by faith, “died in faith,” could come of a mere political institution? He has not attempted an answer? 3. We then pressed, also, the fact that Christ was the foundation of their faith—by his stripes they were healed—I Cor. x. 3-4; 1. Pet. i. 9-11; Is. liii. entire, hence they trusted on Christ as really as we do. He passed it all in silence. As all in all ages trusted in Christ as the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, they are one with him. 4. We showed that the church existed before circumcision, hence not founded on it. 5. We showed that circumcision was not re-enacted or practiced till the Jews settled in Canaan—for forty years not a soul was circumcised, yet they are not only called “the church of Jehovah” then, but ate of the spiritual meat, drank of the spiritual drink—yea drank of Christ. 1, Cor. x. 3-4, while in the wilderness, and called “the church” then also, Acts vii. 38. 6. We showed that the two ordinances baptism and the Lord’s supper were administered and were purely symbolic as well as circumcision. Gen. xvii. 11, with Rom. iv. 11; ii. 28-29; Col. ii. 11; Ex. xii. 5-21, etc.; Ex. xxx. 18-20; Lev. viii. 6; Num. viii. 7; xix. 13; Ezek. xxxvi. 25; Isa. xlv. 3; Heb. ix. 10, 13, 19, 21; 1 Cor. x. 1-2; Ps. li. 2-9, etc. Hence the administration of circumcision was no more a carnal ordinance than is baptism to-day, and it was as purely symbolic of purity, as the texts just cited clearly assert. Did he meet these facts? No attempt was made. He aims to offset all by asserting that no law or provision existed for expelling unfaithful members. This we promptly exposed elaborately, or rather had fully anticipated in our first speech which was read. He asserted that bad men were in that “institution,” hence it was carnal. We showed 1. That bad men—very mean men, crept into the church in (1) Paul’s day, Gal. ii. 4.

(2) in Jude's day, Epis. to Jude, v. 4-9; (3) in Peter's day, 1. Epis. ii. 4-11; and in John's day, 3. Epis. v. 9-11.

2. That bad men are in his and our churches to-day, too many by odds. Hence to rely on such a fact for argument was astonishing. Such were the leading objections he offered to our facts from the Bible.

We showed that before baptism was ordained or named in the Old Testament, provision was made for incorporating Gentiles with their infant offspring into the Jewish church. That one law and one custom, and one ordinance should be to both. Baptism was instituted after this event. Hence as a Jew could not approach the altar without purification through baptism, as symbolic of a purified heart, much less could a Gentile approach into the congregation or the church uncleansed. We detailed the Bible facts. They always brought in their infants with them. Thus were they proselyted—discipled. This continued up till the commission was given. As the Apostles were all Jews, Christ a Jew, and no restrictions were laid on, but an adherence to the past custom commanded—"all things whatsoever I have commanded you"—"I came not to destroy, but to fulfill"—it enjoined infant baptism as much as adult baptism.

He relied, finally, on "disciple" as excluding infants. He asserted that it implied previous teaching. "You cannot teach an infant, hence he cannot be baptized. We replied—

1. It does not imply previous teaching. This we proved, (1) by the greatest of scholars. (2) by Christ's process of discipling. Matt. iv. and ix. 9. (3) by the discipling of all infants of converted Gentiles with their parents. (4) by Num. iii. 28, where 8,600 infants a month old and upward were put in a state of discipleship for future use.

2. We showed that if his interpretation and position on that point were correct, still he was wrong, and we right, because (1) Timothy was a disciple when *brephæ* an infant. He had been "taught" "from infancy"—2. Tim. iii. 15-17, (2) from Doctor Graves' position as soon as any one is capable of being taught, he is capable of being baptized. But at two, two and a half, and three, four and five years old—varying those ages as degrees of capacity are found, infants are taught, and

taught most valuable and impressive lessons. In those ages, the most enduring impressions are made—from two to five years old. In Bible and church phraseology, this is infancy. In this age—in this period the seeds are sown—the lessons impressed in vast numbers of cases that make or defeat all future character. By the commission we are commanded to baptize our infants, even if Doctor Graves' interpretation should be excepted, unsupported as it is. You may not evade that duty. It is a command by Jesus Christ. We appealed to History. We found that in the year 90 after John's death or 89, rather, Tertullian found baptism of infants a universal practice in the church. Origen, born 84 years after John's death found it universal. Irenæus, born before John's death found it universal. The 66 bishops 150 years after John's death found it universal, in the most cultivated part of the civilized world. We showed that the entire space between this council and the Apostles—between Origen or Tertullian and the Apostles was covered by Papias, Justin Martyr, Clemens Alexandrinus, Irenæus, Polycarp, Ignatius—most holy, learned and pious men. Had infant baptism entered the church during this time at any point, a storm of opposition would have met it, and a world of discussion ensued. No such fact occurred. Its entrance would have implied 1. New doctrines. 2. A radical change in practice. No such change could have come in without a fearful commotion and schisms almost endless. Not a trace of any such thing appears. Hence it was Apostolic. Tertullian opposes it as an existing practice of the church—as much so as the baptizing of “young people,” “widows” or any other class whose baptism he opposes in the same paragraph with the other.

Gentlemen Moderators, we have done our duty. Let every one do his—bring up your children in the way they should go—in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Earliest impressions are always the most lasting.—[*Time out.*]

[At the close of Dr. Graves' reply to the above, it was urged by Dr. Ditzler that some new matter was introduced by Dr. Graves, e. g.—his strictures on *parvuli* as used by Tertullian, and Irenæus' use of *regenerated*, and several other points that on his part had not been introduced, but could be replied to under proposition 5th, where this matter would come up again. See 1st Reply on Prop. v.]

DR. GRAVES' ELEVENTH CLOSING REPLY.

MR. PRESIDENT:—My opponent has concluded his argument to prove that Infant Baptism, as practiced by the M. E. Church South, for this was the proposition accepted for discussion by Eld. Ditzler's committee, is authorized by the word of God. Has he shown any authority in God's Word for it? for a positive law must be grounded in precept, or clear and long continued example, says Blackstone, and so say all jurists. Has Eld. Ditzler given you a precept or command found in the Bible? Not one. Has he so much as claimed that he has? Never once, nor intimated that he has. Has he quoted an example of Infant Baptism in either Testament? Not one, nor does he claim to have done so. He has published to the world that the commission is the only law by which to baptize any one, and has he found authority in it? He has scarcely mentioned it in the whole discussion. What has he based the practice upon? Upon the identity of the church in all ages, and the covenant—made in the garden with Eve, he said, but I showed him that what he called a covenant there, was made with Satan—that called the church into existence, and which covenant was renewed to Abraham, re-establishing the church in his family, that continued through all the ages until this day; and since it embraced children in its covenant provisions at the beginning, it embraces them to-day. In reply to all this, I first asked him to define what he meant by *church* as he used it, and he gave me the definition of what is called the "invisible church"—the whole company of the saved in Heaven!

I have repeatedly asked him if he would endorse the definition of church found in the articles of his own Discipline, and he has refused for three days to answer me. He has known from the first day that it would be certain death to him to define correctly a visible church, or to endorse the article in the Discipline, since that church never existed before the advent

of Christ, for according to his own authors, without Christian baptism there cannot be and there never was a visible church.

In his invisible church *there never was an ordinance of any kind*, and of course no baptism, nor was there ever a living infant and how then could this church in any way authorize infant baptism?

But I showed that there was no church in the Garden—or Satan was the head of it—nor in the family of Abel, or Noah, or Abraham, Isaac or Jacob. I conclusively demonstrated that the Covenant of Redemption was never made with mortal sinful flesh, and that the covenant with Noah or the covenants made with Abraham, whether considered as two or one, or the covenant at Mount Sinai, never called a Christian church into existence, and therefore could in no sense warrant Infant Baptism.

After six speeches, Elder Ditzler confessed to the congregation that he surrendered those covenants—the covenants we have been discussing—as affording any ground for Infant Baptism, and upon this surrender of the covenants, which of course surrendered with it the whole church identity argument, I closed the Old Testament, since it confessedly furnished no authority for Infant Baptism.

So much at least has been accomplished by this debate, so far as Methodists South are concerned. The argument for Infant Baptism as heretofore based on the Covenant of Circumcision, is openly surrendered and must be abandoned so long as Elder Ditzler bears the endorsement of the Bishops of his church.

His proposed argument was that drawn from analogy between the Old and New Testament Churches, but it broke down with him, but suppose it had not; *analogy can prove nothing*.

Leaving the Old he opened the New Testament, but not a precept for it or example of Infant Baptism, has he produced to authorize it, and if he had found authority for the *practice*, it was still incumbent upon him to show that it was *practiced* to wash away the guilt of original sin and to deliver the infant from God's wrath, as his church teaches, by Wesley, by her standard writers, and the Discipline.

He has sketched through the New Testament, asking me a multitude of questions and claiming that certain passages are in harmony with the practice, or render it probable.

I think I have fully answered or indicated my answers to all his questions which I deem relevant to this subject, and I have guarded against wasting time on irrelevant matters, with which his speeches have abounded. My answers and the difficulties I presented, by way of replication, I will briefly sum up here.

1. He asked me *when* the church or Christ's visible kingdom was "set up?" I answered, The gathering of the first material or subjects was accomplished by John the Baptist, the first ordained minister of the Gospel, and he was ordained and commissioned by the King himself as Herald, the first officer of his staff. John made the proclamation and terms of amnesty and peace, and did make ready a people, subjects for his Lord, by immersing in the Jordan those who gave him evidence of repentance toward God and faith in the Messiah.

And these subjects Christ accepted, and assumed jurisdiction over them. We see here the essential elements of a kingdom. 1. A king; 2. Subjects; 3. Jurisdiction claimed and acknowledged; 4. Territory.

"Bride" is preeminently one of the titles Christ gives his church. John said of Jesus, after he had received these subjects, "he that *hath* the Bride, is the bridegroom," and he could as properly have said, "he that hath the kingdom is the king."

We have here the germ, the "mustard-seed," state of the Kingdom of Heaven that had never appeared on earth before, set up, as Daniel prophesied it would be, in the days of the kings of the fourth universal Empire, the Roman, and under the reign of a Cæsar. I have affirmed and do affirm that to have been a real visible organization comprised entirely of subjects immersed upon a profession of repentance and faith.

1. *It was an organization, that could be entered.*

"But the publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of God before you
—Matt. xxi. 31.

2. *The entrance could be "shut up,"* which is not true of the invisible church if there be one.

"But woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men : for ye neither go in *yourselves*, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in." Matt. xxiii, 13

3. *It could be violently assailed and suffer at the hands of its enemies.*

"12. And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force."—Matt. xi. 12.

This invisible kingdom, if there be one, cannot be assaulted or injured, for *biadzo*, rendered in our version "suffereth violence" means to suffer *injury, outrage, wrong*—as "*biadzesnai tade*" "I am wronged herein," Soph. Ant. 66, *biadzesthai parthenon*, to do violence to, or force a maiden—nor could the invisible state be taken by force—*arpadzo*, means "to tear, ravish away, to seize and overpower"—and if it had had an existence in the bosom of these Jews for thousands of years, why had it not been assailed, opposed and maltreated before?

If this expression means "getting religion" as my friend claims, how is it that it is so much harder work from the days of John the Baptist until now, than from the days of Abel, Abraham or Moses until John?

4. *It had never been preached before, and men invited to enter it, for it had not existed.* "For the law and the prophets were until John; since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it," Luke xvi. 16. The gospel of man's salvation had been preached, but the church had not been opened and men invited to enter it.

5. *It was an organization that could come nigh and unto the people.* "And say unto them, the kingdom of God is come nigh unto you," Luke x. 9–11. "But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you"—Matt. xi. 11–28. Luke says "upon you" x. 20. The invisible kingdom is never nearer at one time than another, and it never is said to come unto or upon men, and if Christ had had a visible church among and of that people for four thousand years he could not say it had at that time come nigh or unto them.

6. *As it was an organization that had been brought to and set up among, the Jews in the very capital of their nation and its privileges*

offered to them, so it could be taken from them. This fact clearly explains the prophecy of Christ, Matt. xxi. 43, which was fulfilled when the gospel and this self-same gospel church was taken from the Jews and given to the Gentiles, and until this day especially belongs to them. This meets "the kingdom shall be taken away from you," of Elder Ditzler's argument from this passage, and throws the clearest light upon another. I will tell him that in the figure of the "Olive Tree" which he has so misinterpreted and misapplied, the "good olive tree" represents the Christian church, on this we are agreed, but I say that church was established during the ministry of John and Christ.

It was at first and for years composed *entirely of Jews*, and these were as the first-fruits of the nation from the preaching of the Gospel, and were acceptable unto God, and an earnest that the lump and mass of the nation, will ultimately be gathered and received, and so the day cometh when all Israel, then existing shall be saved—in that day when the promised Deliverer shall come to Zion.

Let the candid inquirer read the whole of the eleventh chapter of Romans by the light of this fact, and it is as clear as unclouded noonday. The Root was Christ and he, a Jew, that furnished fatness to the good olive tree—the church—into which, the Jews were introduced by faith in which while they did stand, they stood by faith, and for the lack of which they were broken off, rejected, and the Gentiles introduced by faith, in which they stand by faith, and from which they will be broken off, and cast away if they do not believe. The chapter is a delightful prophecy of the restoration and final salvation of the Jews as a people, that when the times of the Gentiles shall have been fulfilled, then the remnant of Jacob that shall be left shall be turned unto the Lord, and that prophecy shall be fulfilled when "a nation will be born in a day." Paul tells us that as the casting away of Israel redounded unto the riches of the Gentiles, the receiving of them will be as life from the dead to the Gentiles. Millions of Gentiles will be converted to the faith of the Gospel when God fulfills his promise to the fathers, and this explains, as I have before intimated, the passage so misapplied

by Eld. Ditzler. Acts xv. 16. "After this I will return and build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen down, and I will build up the ruins thereof, and I will set it up." This has no reference whatever to building up again the visible church of Christ which had fallen into ruins, for Daniel had prophesied of Christ's kingdom that when set up, it should never be broken in pieces; and Christ had said that the gates of hell *shall not* prevail against it—but this was spoken of David's literal House, the Royal Throne of his Kingdom, now long fallen down and in ruins, then to be set up, and David's Son, the antitypical Solomon to reign upon it forever. This passage as well as that of the Olive Tree has sole reference to the restoration of the Jews in the "latter days," and their conversion to Christianity, when they will be grafted along with the Gentiles by faith in Christ into his Church, which had been aforetime offered to them by John, by Christ and the apostles, but which the mass of them had rejected against their own souls, and therefore it had been hidden and taken from them. As I told him when he introduced it, *this church* never had a non-believing infant or any but professed believers, for all in it stand by *faith* of which infants are incapable.

I have also indicated to him that he could not have introduced a ground to authorize Infant baptism more fatal to his cause than Proselyte baptism.

Let me review it before you, for if he has any other ground left him, I cannot find it, and this is *quicksand* beneath his feet.

Eld. Ditzler's position, and those who stand with him is, that John's and Christ's baptism was but a continuation of Proselyte baptism, and as all the children of the family were baptized with their Gentile parents, so all the children however young, of parents who are proselyted to Christ, should be baptized.

Now grant that Proselyte baptism had existed, before the days of John, which the latest and ripest scholarship of the age agree in denying, let us see what good the rite will do his cause.

1. If Proselyte Baptism had existed one thousand years, it was at best a man's invention, one of the traditions of the El-

ders, *for God never commanded it.* This fact all scholars admit. Infant Baptism then is but a *tradition* of Judaism.

2. But no Jew with his children ever submitted to Proselyte Baptism. It was not a law unto Jews, and yet John baptized Jews as well as Gentiles, but never told the Jew or Gentile to bring their infant children along with them.

If Christian baptism is but a continuation of Proselyte baptism, then no Jew could ever have been or can now be baptized.

But the Gentile proselyte could bring his children and slaves with him, however old. Yet Eld. Ditzler will only admit infant children. Where is his law for cutting off children fifteen or fifty years old? By that law I will cut off the non-believing infant. But the Gentile could bring only his own children to Proselyte Baptism. Yet Eld. Ditzler claims the right to baptize the infants of all unbelievers as well as believers, Jews as well as Gentiles.

But according to the law of Proselyte Baptism, the one baptism of the father and his children, sufficed for all succeeding generations. There was no Proselyte Baptism required of the children of his children, forever; they were, *de lege*, Jews. Yet Eld. Ditzler preaches the duty of the children of each family to be baptized in their generation as their fathers were. By what law? But Proselyte Baptism incorporated the children of the Proselytes into Eld. Ditzler's Jewish church, and gave them a rite to the Passover, and all the privileges of it. Yet Eld. Ditzler declares that no infant or child he administers his Proselyte baptism to is in any sense, a member of the church; is not numbered with them, and is not entitled to the Lord's Supper which came in lieu of the Passover. How is this?

But finally, Proselyte baptism was by *immersion of the whole body* in water by the proselyte himself, and yet Eld Ditzler teaches sprinkling in place of immersion. And he would not receive it as baptism in any sense if the subject should dip himself or sprinkle water upon himself! How is this?

But I have put it in proof that the theory that proselyte baptism existed before John the Baptist's day, which years ago was advocated by Wall and Lightfoot and others, has been

exploded and relinquished by all later scholars. I know of no living standard scholar who now holds to it. I have quoted Fairbairn, Pressense, Stuart, and others.

What must the Christian-thinking portion of this audience think when they hear Elder Ditzler rest Infant Baptism upon Proselyte baptism, at best, but a Rabbinical tradition and not instituted for ages after the law of Christian Baptism was given! This, so far, is his firmest foundation, and it is *quicksand*. My opponent, as you all must have observed, has avoided the commission as he would a pest house, and yet he may in the end claim that because it does not in so many words forbid the baptism of infants, it allows, and therefore ordains it! Cannot the Catholic as justly claim that the commission ordains the baptism of mules and bells? I will say this and no more touching the commission here, as we shall spend a whole day upon it when we reach the fifth proposition. When Elder Ditzler claims that it addresses or embraces infants, that moment he as openly consigns every unbaptized infant to perdition, as Wesley and the General Conference do in the Doctrinal Tracts, and as Elder Ditzler does impliedly when he sprinkles an infant using the Ritual of the Discipline.

I have showed that John baptized no children, and therefore they could not have been among the material he prepared for Christ's Church, and I brought forward the frank admission of eminent Pedobaptist commentators to this plain fact.

I showed that his claims that Christ's words to His disciples when they brought little children unto Him that he might lay his hands upon them and bless them, were utterly without reason, and that this passage has long since been surrendered by all modern critics and commentators, and that the very fact that the disciples rebuked those who brought young children to Him was conclusive evidence that hitherto they had baptized no children, and that they were unknown as members of the church as yet. I was justified in concluding that during the ministry of Christ, no children were taken into the church or baptized, and the law of baptism

given to the apostles positively forbids the baptism of infants, since it was limited to *believers*.

I have passed over the entire record of the Acts of the Apostles, and found that the Holy Spirit, the unerring and faithful chronicler of all important events and acts, nowhere indicates that infants or unbelievers were ever baptized—but in every instance, where the subjects are mentioned, believers are specified—and when households are mentioned, the Holy Spirit is careful to tell us that all the members believed and rejoiced, or were comforted, or could, or had “addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints.”

I then examined the teachings of all the Epistles, and ascertained the true symbolism, or design of Christian baptism, and found that in every case, it was for a profession of personal faith in Christ—a profession of personal union with Him—that One had died to sin—had arisen to walk in a new life—and thus had put on Christ before the world—acts that would be meaningless, were baptism applied to unconscious babes or unregenerate sinners; and I thus found that infant baptism was opposed to the very symbolism of baptism, and the perpetual analogy of Christianity.

I then examined the character of the membership of the churches planted by the Apostles, and I found that the Apostles addressed each as composed of “saints,” “brethren,” “faithful in Christ” Jesus, that all had been baptized into Christ, and thus had put on Christ, *i. e.*, had made a personal profession of discipleship to Christ, and, that they had been baptized to obtain the answer of a good conscience toward God, and therefore, the apostolic churches must have been composed of professed believers only.

I also notice the fact that, Paul declared to the church at Ephesus, that he had declared the whole counsel of God to them, and he doubtless did to all other churches, but, in his Epistle to this church, or to any other church, he nowhere intimates that it is the duty of Christian parents to baptize their children, and bring them into the church—he promises no blessings, holds out no reward for doing it, and threatens no penalty for failing to do it; neither does Peter, James.

John, nor Jude, and therefore we are bound to conclude that infant baptism is not a part of the counsel of God.

Having followed him from lid to lid of the Bible and shown he has not offered the least semblance of authority for Infant Baptism, I have presented you with the testimony of the most eminent Pedobaptist historians and commentators, embracing the very best scholarship Pedobaptists boast of, and these men honestly admit and declare that the Word of God affords neither precept for, nor example of, Infant Baptism, and many tell you frankly that the rite was not known in the apostolic age, and that it is manifestly a tradition of men. There is no historian of any sect who declares that it was practiced in the first century, and this is all that concerns us. Mark this fact.

His argument that Infant Baptism must be Scriptural because it was mentioned so early as A. D. 150, proves too much, for it would prove that trine immersion and baptismal regeneration, and a host of other confessedly human traditions were scriptural also; but Origen tells us expressly, that Infant Baptism was a tradition.

I next brought forward the fact that the majority of the Christian Fathers, the children of Christians, were not baptized in infancy. I gave the names of a number of them embracing Origen, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Austin, Jerome, the Emperor Constantine, and several others. And I affirm that my opponent cannot name one Christian Father or man in the first four centuries who was baptized in his infancy. Must not this fact make its proper impression upon every candid Christian mind? Dr. Wall regarded it as the most difficult fact he had to grapple with, and the strongest historical fact Baptists had brought forward in opposition to Infant baptism, and I have brought it forward here, and asked my opponent, as he had paid so little attention to my arguments against the practice, to notice this, but has he done so?

Finally I claim, as I have a right to claim, that my Refutation throughout has been most thorough and complete. I should consider that I had done but comparatively little to have simply exposed the sheer fallacy of Eld. Ditzler's arguments in support of Infant Baptism, I feel satisfied that I have

done this—the countenances of this audience, of the many Pedobaptist ministers before me, whom I know, convince me of this,—and more than this. I have explained many passages of Scripture, hitherto pressed into the service of Infant Baptism, and satisfactorily shown that they discredited the practice; but in addition to this, I have presented thirty-eight arguments, in due logical form, any one of which is a thorough refutation of the practice. He has but twice, if my memory serves me, referred to them, and then not to answer, but to make light of them !

The discussion of this proposition must certainly accomplish a great good. It has more clearly brought out the fact so frankly confessed by my opponent, that the Old Testament covenants, which include the Covenant of Circumcision, give no support to Infant Baptism.

2. That there is no more identity between the church of the Old Testament and that of the New, than between a thing that has no existence, and never had, and a thing that has. The church identity theory is exploded.

3. That the only authority that can be raised for Infant Baptism is, not scriptural precept or example, but analogy and inference, and probability, while the teachings and practice of John, of Christ, and of all his apostles, together with the whole symbolism of Christian baptism, is opposed to, and in contradiction of, Infant Baptism; and not until the fundamental doctrine of justification by personal faith alone had been corrupted, was Infant Baptism brought in.

Now, in conclusion, let me say to my opponent, influenced by his closing remarks on the former proposition and repeated in other phrase during the discussion of this—Baptists of the Southwest can never be conquer'd nor Methodism defended by such weapons and materials of war as you have thus far used in this conflict. You may assure your heart of this fact. If Pedobaptists present will but take a word of advice from me—who am not your enemy, because I have told you the truth—you will never sprinkle another babe, and thus forever deprive it of obeying Christ for itself when it becomes

a believer, until your religious teachers can show you at least one precept, one command for, or example of it, in the New Testament, and if they cannot do it, you may know it is only a commandment—a mere tradition of *men*—displeasing to Christ, for He has said: “In vain do they worship me, who teach for doctrine the commandments of men.” Every Christian on this earth can unite upon the *immersion* of *believers*, without the sacrifice of a principle, as this Debate has abundantly shown. And if all Christians do not unite with Baptists on immersion and a regenerated church membership, the sin cannot be laid at the door of my brethren.—[*Time out.*

THE
GREAT CARROLLTON DEBATE.

THIRD PROPOSITION.

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM IS PREREQUISITE TO THE LORD'S SUPPER.

DR. GRAVES Affirms.
DR. DITZLER Denies.

[DR. GRAVES' OPENING SPEECH.]

MR. PRESIDENT :—I am peculiarly circumstanced this morning. I stand here to defend the Discipline, the Satute-Book of the M. E. Denomination against one of its own authorized ministers and Episcopally endorsed champions !

In the discussion of a previous question, you were made astonished when I forced him to publicly take issue with the Ritual of his Society, but he treated that as a light matter—being but the shell and shuck of Christianity, which the church could change, and that the meat and matter of it were contained in the Articles of Religion, which were inviolable and unchangeable. But, lo ! and behold, in denying this question, he is at direct issue, as he was on infant innocency and purity, with the very articles of his faith, which he has solemnly sworn to his overseers, before his God, to defend !

1. He is engaged to deny that the Supper is in the Church of Christ. Do you not ? Now, the articles of his Discipline positively say that both Baptism and the Supper are sacraments *in* the church, as we shall presently see, and against its teachings he will be compelled to “inveigh” to support this denial.

He is against the teachings of all the theological writers, Wesley, Clark, Watson, Hibbard, etc., endorsed by his church as standard, known to me, as he had the boldness to put himself against all the standard lexicographers, scholars, historians and critics upon the two former questions. He is truly a bold man. He is made of the metal that champion controversialists need be made of, I mean those who make controversy a business, a profession, as Eld. Ditzler does.

But I am fortunate in standing here this day, for the first time during this debate, to defend the common faith, on this point, of every denomination represented, or unrepresented, in this house, Disciples, Presbyterians, of all sorts, Episcopalians, high and low, Methodists, North and South, Baptists—and thank God, the teachings of the Sacred Word. It is at least gratifying to know that it is possible for us all to agree on any one thing, and may the time soon come when we can agree on all that Christ has taught as well, and so be one body, having but one Divine Head—and I believe the prayer of Christ will yet be answered; all true Christians will one day be one—mere partizans, never.

It is not with the Methodist Church, as she makes herself known through her Articles and Books published by the General Conference, that I am antagonizing, but with an individual member, Eld. Ditzler, who, in this, represents not the faith, but the permitted *loose*, and pernicious *practice* of his Church.

If ever there was one settled question in christendom touching Church Order, it certainly is this, but this age leaves nothing quiet. The whole world is as a vast caldron boiling and seething with the agitation of questions of all sorts, and there is nothing so established that it is not broken up and thrown in. My first premise in proof of my proposition is—

I. THE LORD'S SUPPER IS A RELIGIOUS RITE INSTITUTED FOR, AND GIVEN TO HIS CHURCH BY CHRIST, TO BE RESTRICTED TO THE LIMITS OF ITS DISCIPLINE.

Now the rites of an institution belong to the institution because they are *in it*; because so under the control of the organized members, that they cannot be administered without their consent. There is, therefore, this strict distinction to be

observed, between a *rite* and ordinance. A rite is an institute or ceremony of an organized body, committed to it, or instituted by it, to be administered only by its authority and under its direction, and to whom it judges fit to receive it.

An *ordinance*, more strictly, is any act appointed to be done or observed, that may be done by any number and in a social manner, but is not a ceremony of the Church, *e. g.* prayer, singing, etc. Christ designated no particular persons, or legally qualified officers to perform them as he did the *rites* of Baptism and the Supper.

SCRIPTURAL PROOFS.

That Christ appointed The Supper to be observed in His Churches, we learn from the fact that He first instituted it in His Church and administered it to the members of His Church gathered together in one place.

I recognize that body of disciples, though only eleven in number, gathered in the upper chamber, as the church of Christ. It is not a multitude that makes a church. Christ had fore-designated how few would be recognized by Him—"two or three are gathered in his name," under his authority, he would be present with them as their Head, *e. g.*, our missionaries to foreign fields are sent forth, two or more with their families, and on reaching their stations they organize themselves into a church, by covenanting to take the New Testament as their constitution, and Christ as their Head. Two males and two females generally compose our first mission churches. These disciples were gathered under his authority, to obey his laws, and he himself was with them. They were a body "of faithful men, to whom the pure word was preached, and by whom the ordinances were duly administered, according to Christ's appointment in all things." How far soever we may fail to administer them, there is not one of us that doubts they administered them just as Christ commanded, and how far soever our most renowned churches may fail in purity of membership, this was without doubt, the purest body of Christians that ever met on this fallen earth. They possessed all the characteristics of a true Christian Church.

1. *They were all true believers in Christ.* Jesus said to

them (probably just before the Supper), "Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you." They had received or welcomed the Word of God into their hearts.

2. *They had been baptized.* It is not necessary that we should have the history of their baptism in order to prove the fact.

(a). They were acknowledged by Christ as his *disciples and brethren*. He never, throughout his public ministry, acknowledged any as his disciples and brethren who had not acknowledged him in baptism. (b). Jesus sent His disciples to preach and baptize. If they had not been baptized, they would have been chargeable with an inconsistency which is sharply reprehended by the pen of inspiration, (Roman. ii, 21). (c). He asked them if they were able to *be baptized into* the baptism into which he was baptized. This figurative allusion implies that they had already received, like Him, a baptism in water. (d). Jesus Himself received baptism and He taught that "a disciple is not above his master;" (e). most unquestionably that the disciples of Jesus accepted the baptism of John; otherwise they, like the Scribes and Pharisees, rejected the counsel of God against themselves (f). Paul and all who were converted to the Christian faith accepted this initiatory rite.

3. *They were church members.* Here again it is not necessary to have a history of the fact in order to prove the fact. I will give a definition of a church in the light of the New Testament. Is it a company of baptized believers united together under the headship of Christ for mutual edification in Him, and for the purpose of securing the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth?

You can give no true definition of an evangelical church which will not include the twelve whom Jesus chose and "ordained," or organized. The Head and members were there. They were controlled by specific authority—government. They had specific rites. There was the pillar and ground of the truth. Thence sounded out the Word of God into all the world.

4. The twelve received abundant instruction from our Lord before the Supper was instituted. Besides the public dis-

courses to which they listened, Jesus expounded all things to His disciples in private. The Christian institution of Teaching was set up by Jesus Himself. The twelve were wont to wait on his ministry.

5. The Fellowship, or a common fund for common use, was established before the crucifixion of Jesus. Judas had the keeping of it, and took therefrom, by stealth, what was put therein, but its use is clearly explained. Therefrom was bought what was needed in common, and distributions were wont to be made to the poor. Hence we see that those who received the Supper at first from the Lord, and those to whom they delivered it, were (1), *Believers*; (2), who had been *baptized*; and (3), banded organically together into a *church*; and (4), who attended on systematic *teaching*; and (5), maintained a common *fellowship*; (6) administered the appointed ordinances.

The Articles of Religion of the Methodist Episcopal Society acknowledge this little body to be a church of Christ—not a hypocrite nor an unregenerate person in it.

2. Christ had previously recognized the company of baptized disciples, who received Him as their Lord and Master, as His church. Matt. xviii. When he gave the law for disciplining an offending brother, He had declared that they were the body He was establishing as his *church*, against which the gates of hell should never prevail. He here gives them a name that they must have understood, and one by which they ever after designated themselves. We are not wont to name a thing before it exists!

3. The Holy Spirit, by the mouth of David and Paul, declares this body a church, Heb. ii. 12: "Saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the *church* will I sing praise unto thee." If He ever before sang with them, it is not recorded, but it is, at the close of the supper, for "they sang a hymn and went out.

4. Christ then by the mouth of David called this company a church.

2. The Lord Jesus commanded it to be observed in His church when He commissioned His apostles, by placing it after baptism.

3. The apostles understood this and so instructed the churches, as we learn from their invariable practice. I quote from Dr. Hibbard, a standard Methodist Text Book :

"It will be more satisfactory to inquire, *How* the apostles understood the commission with respect to the *relative order* of the Christian institute. The argument from *apostolic precedent* is undeniably important. They were commissioned to *teach* the converted nations 'to observe *all things whatsoever*' Christ had *commanded*. This was the extent, and this the limit of their authority

What, then, did the apostles teach and practice with respect to the *time* and *relative order* of baptism? On the day of Pentecost, when the people inquired of the apostles: 'Men and brethren, what shall we do?' Peter answered, *Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ,* ' etc. (Acts ii. 38.) Luke sums up the glorious results of that memorable day thus: "Then they that *gladly received His* word were *baptized*; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and *in breaking of bread*, and in prayers.' (Acts vii. 41, 42.) This was the first occasion in which the Apostles had been called upon to exercise their high commission. And here, indeed, we are called upon to notice particularly the *order* in which they enforced the divine precepts. Upon their anxious hearers they enjoined, first, repentance, *then* baptism; *then* the duty of church membership; and *then* 'breaking of bread,' or the Lord's Supper. Comparing the *order* here observed with the *order* of the words of the commission, we are struck with admiration at the prompt fidelity of the Apostles." (*Hibbard on Baptism*, part 2, pp. 176-179.)

And after quoting Acts viii : 12 ; ix : 18 ; x : 47, 48 ; xiii : 36-38 ; xvi : 14, 15-33 ; and xviii : 8, on pages 179 and 180, "to illustrate the uniform practice of the Apostles," Dr. Hibbard adds : "The above quotations need no comment to make them plainer in their teaching respecting the relative order of baptism. They bear unequivocal testimony to the point that baptism was commanded and observed as the first act of religious duty after conversion. This was apostolic practice. * * It will not be doubted that what the Apostles enjoined upon their converts, is equally binding upon the disciples of Jesus in all ages. * * Is not baptism binding upon us as the next duty after conversion, as much as it was upon Cornelius or the converts on the day of Pentecost?" Hib. as above.

That the Lord's Supper is a church ordinance or rite, all denominations known to me teach.

The Methodist Discipline, Art. xiii., declares :

The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered, according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

Baptism and the Lord's Supper which Methodists call sacraments are *in the church*, according to this Article.

Dr. Hibbard of the Genessee Conference in his work on Baptism, published by Conference, and one of the text books young ministers are required to study—says :

"The eucharist, from its very nature, is a *church ordinance*, and as such, can be properly participated in by *church members only*. As a church ordinance, it never can be carried out of the church. This is so evident that no words can make it more plain, or add to it force." (*Hibbard on Baptism*, part 2. p. 185.)

The Presbyterian church so teaches.

II. "The visible Church, which is also catholic or universal under the gospel (not confined to one nation as before under the law), consists of all those throughout the world, that profess the true religion, together with their children ; and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation."

Under chapter XXIX we read : "The Lord's Supper to be observed in *his church* unto the end of the world, and to be a bond and pledge of their communion with him and with each other, as members of his mystical body."

I now lay down my second premise :

II. NO ONE IS ENTITLED TO MEMBERSHIP AND ITS PRIVILEGES IN A CHURCH OF CHRIST, UNLESS BAPTIZED.

This being true, and all denominations agree again in this, it follows irresistably that Baptism is the only rite by which believers are initiated into a Church.

The Discipline for 1850 says : page 24, section 2nd :

"None should be received until they are recommended by a leader with whom they have met at least six months on *trial and been baptized*."

Have you changed this law in both respects ? For the last edition of that law of Methodism says :

"The minister shall cause the candidates to be placed conveniently before the congregation, and after baptizing any who may not have been previously baptized, he shall say," etc.

I said that I was defending the Discipline against Eld. Ditzler. What will he say to this ? Will he go back on this law ? Will he inveigh against his own Discipline ? Mark what he will say to this ?

I offer a few direct Scripture proofs :

John iii. 5 : "Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

His visible Kingdom must have been in existence—from the days of John for none could *enter* it without baptism.

Acts ii. 41: "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added *unto them* about three thousand souls."

Baptism is the act by which they were added.

I Cor. xii. 13: "For in one Spirit are we all baptized into one body whether *we be* Jews or Gentiles, whether *we be* bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit."

The following distinguished Pedobaptist writers confirm my proposition that it was water baptism referred to here which united those baptized to the church of Christ.

DR. JOHN SCOTT.—"We are said to be baptized into the body or church of Christ, I Cor. xii. 13, because baptism, which is our admission into the Christian covenant, is only in other words our admission into the Christian church, which is nothing but the body of Christian people joined and confederated by the New Covenant."—*Chris. Life*, p. ii, ch. vii, § 9.

BP. BURNER teaches that one end and purpose of baptism, according to the teaching of St. Paul "is, that *we are all baptized into one body, we are made members one of another*; we are admitted to the society of Christians, and to all the rites and privileges of that body, which is the church."—Is not the church of Christ the household of faith, at least professedly? I admit that "we cannot see into the sincerity of men's hearts: outward professions and regular actions are all that fall under men's observation and judgment."—On the xxxix Art., pp. 407, 408.

DR. WATTS.—"When a person is baptized, he is said to be received into the Christian church, for hereby he becomes a member of the catholic church visible on earth."—(*On Chris. Commu.*, in *Works*, vol. iii, p. 236).—In the same page Dr. W. has taught that Christ, our "common Lord and Sovereign, has appointed the general rule of admitting members into His churches, viz: that 'all such shall be admitted who make a credible profession of Christianity.'"

J. TRAPP.—"*Are we all baptized?* The apostles received all into the church that believed and were baptized, without particular probation for some days, weeks, months or years."—*Com.* on I Cor. xii, 13.

H. LINTON.—"By the operation of one and the same Spirit have we all been incorporated into one body at our baptism."—*Para.* on I Cor. xii, 13.

DR. JOHN DICK (Presbyterian), speaking of "The two sacraments of the Christian Church," remarks: "I begin with *baptism, by which we are initiated into the fellowship of the Church*, and which, in the order of dispensation, *precedes the Lord's Supper*," etc.—[Dick's Theology. Lect. 88.

DR. GRIFFIN (Presbyterian), in his able *Letter Against Close Communion*, observes: "I agree with the advocates for close communion in *two points*: 1. That baptism is the *initiating ordinance which introduces us into the visible church*. Of course, *where there is no baptism there are no visible churches*: 2. That we ought not to commune with those who are *not baptized*, and of course, are *not church members*, even if we regard them as *CHRISTIANS*." (See Fuller on Com., p. 270.)

"I admit," says Dr. N. L. RICE, "*That we cannot get into the visible Church*

without baptism ; but I will not agree that we can not be pardoned before baptism." (See Campbell and Rice Debate, p 488.)

DR. HIBBARD.—"Baptism, from its very nature, stands at the *opening* of the visible career. It is a *badge* of the Christian profession—the seal of the Gospel covenant,* *the ordinance of admission into the visible Church of Christ*. Previously to baptism, the individual has no rights in the visible Church. * * * * No society of Christians would receive an *unbaptized* person into their community, and tender to him the privileges of their body. So far as proper church rights and privileges are concerned, he is regarded in the same light as any unconverted man. The converts on the day of Pentecost were first *baptized* and thus *added to the church*. *The concurrent voice of the Christian world excludes an unbaptized person from fellowship in the visible Church of God*. (Hibbard on Baptism, part 2, pp. 184, 185.)

My conclusion is, therefore, no one can Scripturally receive The Lord's Supper unless he has received Christian Baptism, since The Supper is one of the privileges of the Church into which no one can enter without baptism.

I will present my first argument in the form of a simple logical syllogism, viz

1. The Lord's Supper is a rite in the Church of Christ, and can only be enjoyed by the members of it.

Can one outside of, not a member of a Masonic Lodge, receive a degree of Masonry—must it not be conferred by the Lodge, and in an organized Lodge?

2. No one can enter the church, or become a member without Christian baptism.

3. *Ergo*, Christian baptism is a prerequisite to the Lord's Supper—Q. E. D.

A second argument is not needed to establish the proposition, but I offer this:

III. BAPTISM IS PREREQUISITE TO THE LORD'S SUPPER, BECAUSE THE DIVINE LAWGIVER PLACED IT IN THIS ORDER, AND HIS APOSTLES INVARIABLY OBSERVED IT IN THIS ORDER, WHICH IS EQUAL TO FUNDAMENTAL LAW.

1. Baptism preceded the institution of the Supper over three years and six months nearly.

2. The Savior invited only those who had been baptized to partake of it.

3. In his commission he placed baptism first, and com-

*NOTE.—I would not be understood as endorsing this statement, it is the very essence of Ritualism.

manded it to be observed in this order—can it be denied that the *order* of the commission is *Law*? My opponent must and will do so. I ask in turn. Is there, respecting the order of the ordinances, *any law*? Has Christ given a law for the constitution of His church and the administration of its services, or left it to float upon every shifting tide of opinion? If a preacher should first organize a church, then baptize its members, and then proceed to disciple them, is his course as lawful, or no more *unlawful*, than one directly the reverse? If unlawful, I ask *WHY*? How can it be unlawful and not contrary to the law? If Christ has given a law, what *is* the law? Is it not contained in the commission? If not, *WHERE*? If in the commission, does it not establish the necessary priority of baptism to church membership? If not, I ask does it establish the priority of faith to baptism? and, if it does, *How*? In any other manner than the *order* in which these duties are prescribed? If not, the order of the commission is a part of its *law*, and this law establishes the priority of baptism to church membership, not less than of faith to baptism. It must be granted, because true, that the *order* in which positive laws are given is as important and as inviolable as the law itself. It may not be violated with impunity. It is openly and palpably violating the law itself and confounds and nullifies its intent. The Divine Lawgiver had a wise design in the arrangement of that order of His laws. To invert them is to *pervert and subvert them*. He did not say go and baptize the sinner, then teach and then disciple, but, *per contra*. He also commanded his Apostles to baptize into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. He had weighty reasons which the thoughtful mind can see for this order. He wished to teach the great fact that officially in contracting and carrying into effect the Covenant of Redemption, the Father is superior to the Son, and the Son to the Holy Spirit. Would not my opponent or any other minister violate this command and justly offend Christ and receive his condemnation who would presume to invert the *order* and baptize into the name of the Holy Spirit, and of the Son, and of the Father? Let this congregation answer this?

To teach the baptized disciples to observe the Lord's Supper is undeniably one of the "all things" which Christ had commanded his Apostles to teach. The grand design of this sacred Supper was that the disciples might be able to discern his body in its celebration. Now to invert the order by which this end is secured is to pervert the Supper and sin a daring sin against Christ, and bring condemnation upon those who observe it! Is this a small matter? Let ministers think of this, lest they bring the condemnation upon their own souls.

Elder Ditzler would have it read: "Go give the Supper to all sinners and idolaters, etc., then teach and disciple them if you can, and then baptize them if they will permit you." He might as well baptize in the name of his father Wesley, R. Watson and Adam Clarke.

4. The apostles understood the inviolability of this order, and they invariably observed it. Read Acts ii, 41-43, and refer to the reasoning of Dr. Hibbard, which I have just read.

There is not an instance in the Sacred Record of the Supper being given to an unbaptized person, or where it was observed save by a church that came together to observe it. The claim that a minister has the right to administer it to whom he pleases and where he pleases, is a most presumptuous one. It is one of the vile beasts that came out of Rome, and should have been left in her to be burned up with her. The ordinances belong to the church and not to the ministry. It is an iniquitous assumption of power for ministers to dare to administer her ordinances and privileges to others than her members—to foreigners. It is taking the children's bread and giving it to dogs. The Law of the Discipline, which has already been cited, clearly recognizes the priority of baptism and commands it as a condition to church membership and church privileges.

My next argument is:

IV. BAPTISM IS ESSENTIALLY PREREQUISITE TO THE PROPER OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER, IN ORDER TO PRESERVE THE GRAND UNDERLYING IDEA WHICH IT SYMBOLIZES, *i. e.*, THAT SPIRITUAL BIRTH MUST PRECEDE SPIRITUAL FOOD.

Our Divine Redeemer and Head, left not with His church mere

empty forms and unmeaning ceremonials. He intended them for the instruction of His ignorant children. He therefore gave them forms that symbolize the deepest, grandest, and most fundamental truths and doctrines of His Kingdom.

As scriptural immersion is pregnant with great truths, on which rests our hope of salvation, so is the supper. But the one I wish to develop here is the underlying truth that there must be spiritual life before spiritual sustenance can be offered—birth before food.

A child must be born into the world before you can give it food to sustain its independent life into which by its birth it has come. The order here is a necessity. It cannot be reversed. It (the child) dies as to its previous mode of life by its severance in birth from its previous means of sustenance, and comes into a separate existence, and then it demands a separate means of perpetuating the life or state into which it has been born. The chick must burst and leave its shell before you can feed it. The kernel of grain must germinate and send forth its roots into the earth before its life-principle can receive sustenance therefrom. So a sinner must be born of the Spirit of God, must come into a new life and relation to God, before he can receive spiritual nourishment suited to his new relation and life. You cannot feed a spiritually dead soul with spiritual food. It must first be born to such a life of the Spirit, and then, and not till then, is it in a state to receive spiritual nourishment. Here is a great law whose order is, in the very nature of the case, irreversible.

Now this law appears in the symbolical language of the ordinances. The first, baptism, symbolizes the death of the sinner to sin, and his resurrection to newness of life through faith in the death and resurrection of Christ. The other, the Supper, symbolizes the fact that this spiritual life into which it has been born, derives its daily sustenance by partaking in faith of the merits of Christ's suffering and death. In the first, we say in symbol that we have died to sin, and risen to a new life in and through Christ. In the second, we say in symbol that this new life is to be fed only through the maintenance of a vital union by faith with Christ, drawing all its spiritual succor and growth from Him.

The first declares to the world that we have come into new spiritual existence. The second declares to the world, the manner in which this new life is sustained. So the *order* of the symbols is as marked and distinct and irreversible as the facts which they symbolize. They perfectly fit the underlying law. Now, as a child must be born before it can be fed, and as the sinner must be born of the Spirit before he can partake of spiritual food; so he must be born of water to symbolize his spiritual birth before he can partake of Christ's broken body and shed blood to symbolize the means by which that life into which it has been born, is sustained. How unnatural and incongruous to reverse this order, and symbolize the means of supporting a life, before you symbolize the beginning of that life! The underlying order of the law, first a new state of life, and then the means of perpetuating it, should regulate the order in which we symbolize the two facts.

This receives further confirmation by the fact that a spiritual birth is a change of our moral relations to God, from enmity to love and oneness, which constitutes a new state, one act of baptism symbolizes this change, and its repetition is uncalled for, and indeed cannot with any propriety be repeated; while on the other hand as the sustenance of that life is a constant necessity, so its symbol is appointed to be observed till Christ's second coming in and by the church with suitable frequency, as a reminder of our drawing constantly our spiritual nourishment from Him. As a fact, spiritual succor must follow spiritual birth, so its symbol should follow the symbol of that birth. How then can I act the unnatural part of attempting to reverse or interchange at pleasure, the order of the symbols? How can I admit its allowability?

I now offer my fifth argument.

V. THE PROFESSED ONENESS OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST—*i. e.*, BODY OF CHRIST IS ONE INTO WHICH ALL ARE BAPTIZED IN ONE SPIRIT.

That the *one* loaf "*heis artos*," see I Cor. 10, which we should use, not *artoi* loaves—indicates that the church partaking, is *one* body, one *undivided* body, unrent into parties, divisions, and factions, by diverse faiths and practices, rites and ceremonies, and

constitution and governments, and religion, and that the Church of Christ (one church here used for all by that figure called *Synecdoche*, when one is put for many, a part for the whole) is *one* body, not many different, hostile, antagonizing bodies, as Methodists, Presbyterians, Catholics, and the Disciples, holding one faith, and that faith which was "once for all delivered to the Saints," and one immersion in and by which that *one* faith in one Lord is professed to the world. Then notice the force of the Greek word the Spirit selected, *artos*, and it means one *kind* of bread, and that *wheaten bread* in distinction from *barley bread*, *madza*. That one loaf must not be a compound of flour made from different kinds of grain, but of *one* and the same, *wheaten flour alone*. Read the whole of the first chapter. The church at Corinth was divided, not with respect to *doctrine*, but into *parties*, one for Paul, one for Apollos, one for Peter, and one for Christ. While in this divided and distracted state it could not celebrate the Lord's Supper, because they would thereby teach that Christ was divided—His body divided—His house divided, and His kingdom divided against itself. Christ never did set up a house or a kingdom *divided* against itself—a kingdom divided into a dozen provinces, under radically different constitutions and governments, waging exterminating warfare against each other, as Catholics, Protestants, and Baptists are, have ever and must ever be, so long as they hold different doctrines and have different church governments—I say exterminating antagonism, for all can see as Methodism prevails in Carrollton, or any given town or county in this nation, and absorbs the population, Presbyterian and Baptist churches are blotted out—exterminated.

But I have previously said that the literal visible kingdom of Israel was a type of Christ's spiritual, visible kingdom. The former was composed of twelve tribes, distinct and independent of each other, locally, like the States of these United States, but all united by one constitution into one kingdom, having the same *head* or king over all, with one *religious faith*, and one form of worship. You see that either tribe might multiply in numbers, prosperity and power to any extent, and it would not effect in the least the increase of any other

tribe. Israel was emphatically *E Pluribus Unum*—one people from many, one nation from many nations or tribes.

Now the Kingdom of Christ is the exact antitype of that type. Many independent local churches—as the *churches* of Galatia, *churches* of Asia, and in twenty-one instances in the New Testament,—not *the church* of Asia or Samaria, North and South, one body embracing a whole State or Kingdom,—I say many local churches, each separate and independent of each other, but all united under one Head and divine King, into one Kingdom, having the same faith, the *same baptism*, administering to the same subjects and for the *self same purpose*. Now each one of these individual churches may increase so as to embrace all persons in the recognized field and not in the least conflict with, or exterminate another church, for it would not absorb into itself the membership of another sister church, no more than one tribe of Israel would absorb another. But should the M. E. Society prevail universally in this town it would absorb and break down every other denomination in it. This must be clear to all, and therefore if any one of these denominations is a true scriptural church, no other and different one can be.

Now to return to the Supper. If the Baptist church in this place could not scripturally take the Supper, if divided into warring factions about the *minister* they would choose for a pastor, and much less if divided as to fundamental doctrines, and the administration of the ordinances, how by Christ's authority, can Methodists, Presbyterians, Disciples, Catholics and Mormons partake of it together? Are they *one body*? Do they hold and teach *one faith*? Do they administer *one baptism* to the *same subjects*, by the same act and for the *same purpose*? Have they the same *head* over them, or law-making power? Is there no difference between a Methodist General Conference, a Presbyterian General Assembly, Brigham Young and *Pio Nono*, the Infallible? These bodies cannot, if indeed so absurd an idea could be granted as that each was a true scriptural church, commune together, while so divided. How much less can Baptist churches join them in celebrating this Supper? It would be a manifest perversion of the design of

the ordinance, and we must be excused for not taking part in such an act. We might as well sprinkle infants for the observance of Christian immersion.

From this doctrine of *oneness* developed by Paul, as symbolized by the Lord's Supper, the church in any *one* place, con-associated by one baptism, gathered with *one* accord, and in *one* mind into *one* room, eating of *one* loaf, composed of the flour of *one kind of grain*, in *one faith*, in *one* and the same *spirit*, and thus professing themselves *one* and the same *body*: all can see that an unbaptized person, though truly regenerate, could not participate in such a Supper, having such a design without perverting and falsifying its teachings, for each member participating unites in the showing forth this design, *i. e.* that the body or *church* is *one*, and that *he* is a member of it—*organically incorporated* with it. Now there is but one way to become incorporated with a church of Christ, and that is by Christian Baptism, as I have proved, "For in *one Spirit* are we all baptized *into one body* * * and have all been made to drink into *one Spirit*." * * "For as the body is *one* and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, *being many are one body*." "Except a man be born of water * * he cannot enter the kingdom, of God," John 3, 5, which is the visible Church of Christ." As the members of our body can only be nourished and strengthened by a union with the body, so a person can only "discern" and show forth the Lord's body, and receive the blessings Christ bestows upon those who truly obey, by remembering Him in it. How could my arm, dissevered from my body, be strengthened, or in any way benefitted by my body, except in organic union with it? By no act could it truly show forth a real vital union with my body so long as an organic union is lacking. No more can an unbaptized Christian symbolize the *oneness* of Christ's body, *i. e.*, his church, and his union and fellowship with it.

Therefore an unbaptized Christian cannot scripturally partake of the Lord's Supper.

DR. DITZLER'S FIRST REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—Doctor Graves starts out by saying he is here to defend our Discipline, and thinks I will be forced to stand alone, and must deny that the supper is in the church. He is here to “defend all the denominations in all the broad land.” He is not here to debate with our church, but with myself on this point. So he tells us. Our proposition reads, “Methodists deny;” not *I* merely. He says they send out missionaries two by two, with their wives and families, and the first thing they do is to organize a church. But if, as he asserts, they can only get into the church by water baptism, and that means a local congregation always, how can they form the church? By your proposition, they were not church members while separated—held membership nowhere. We would say they held it by virtue of being in Christ’s church, and their letters testified to their affiliation with these congregations.

But all Dr. Graves has to say about the wicked, etc., etc., has nothing to do here. Has a regenerate, a saved soul, the right to the Lord’s table, and that at once, as soon as he has trust in Christ; or has he to wait till he can be baptized? Where is the ground, the law requiring such a relation of these services? Where is the truth justifying such a position? It is not, as Dr. Graves argues, giving sustenance to dead, wicked men, but to regenerate, spiritually animated people of God—“sons.”

Before we begin our offsetting arguments, let us read from leading Baptist authorities; and, first, let us now read an editorial by Dr. J. R. Graves, in his paper, “The Baptist,” Memphis, Tennessee, July 4th, 1868:

“No Pedobaptist or Campbellite is authorized to preach the gospel, and we would much prefer to see a Baptist sprinkle a child, than to invite an unbaptized teacher of acknowledged errors—even the fundamental principles of Romanism—into his pulpit, and thus set him before the world as a teacher of true doctrines—an evangelical and scripturally qualified

minister of Jesus Christ. The sprinkling act would be less harmful in its influence. It must be conceded by every unbiased mind that the Scriptures, both by precept and example, warrant no one to preach—to call upon others to repent and be baptized—before he himself has repented and been baptized.

Pedobaptist and Campbellite ministers have never submitted to the baptism Christ commanded. If immersed, there are two things fatal to the validity of the act as Christian baptism.

1. The society that baptized was not an evangelical church, and no organization but a true church of Christ visible, has any authority to administer Christian immersion. A Temperance Society, though composed of ministers or angels, nor a Mormon "church," can administer Christian baptism. These are human societies, and so are Pedobaptist and Campbellite "churches" human societies, devised and set on foot, in opposition to the churches of Christ, by ambitious or misguided men.

2. The design of the baptism administered to them was not scriptural, and therefore the act was null, and worse than a nullity—a gross and dangerous misrepresentation, e. g. : The Campbellite was immersed to secure the remission of his sins, and the regeneration of his heart, and if he is a genuine Campbellite, he has no other change of heart than that he received in the water—and he is, consequently, as certainly **UNBAPTIZED** as he is *unregenerate* and unpardoned. Can Baptists endorse such baptisms as scriptural? They virtually do it when they invite such to preach as ministers, if there is any logic in acts, because they never invite one of their own faith to preach before he has been baptized. When a seat and the right to speak and to vote in the United States Senate is accorded to a man, his claims to be a legitimate Senator of the Congress of the United States is conceded and endorsed.

But even if these ministers had been duly baptized by a regular Baptist Church, holding to the errors they do, they should promptly be excluded, and thereby denied both the pulpit and fellowship of the church, and, of course, denied the administration of, or participation in, the ordinances of the church."

Hear, now, The Texas Baptist Pulpit, a sermon delivered by Elder J. B. Link, pages 18 and 19, 1873 :

"The properly appointed officers of a government alone can administer its laws." "Neither scripture nor reason authorizes us to recognize any man at this day, as an official minister of the gospel, but one appointed to that office by a church of Jesus Christ, nor any pretended administrations of the ordinance of baptism as valid baptism, except those performed by a properly authorized administrator;" p. 19. See also pages 258 and 260, same position, closing with these words as applied to ministers of all other churches: "They are all usurpers and rebels against the government of Christ's Church. Truth requires us to view and treat them as such." p. 265.

Now let us examine the points at issue. By the Baptist po-

sition of Dr. Graves and all the Southwest—no one can take the Lord's supper scripturally, legally, rightfully, unless the following facts hold good, viz:

1. He must be immersed.
2. Immersed by a properly constituted minister.
3. For a proper purpose. See also on this, Howell, 195, as well as Dr. Graves, as just quoted.
4. He must be regenerate before baptized, else he was not Scripturally baptized at all—it is nothing.
5. It must be with the proper symbolism, baptized to represent the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ; else he is not baptized.

So Dr. Graves asserts—Baptists maintain.

1st—Then, notice—he must be immersed, dipped. The man is not allowed the right of decision here for himself—the minister decides for him, or his fellows in the congregation. They do not go by the rules—"by their fruits ye shall know them," and so long as they walk humbly with God, and breathe a spirit of piety, let them decide their mode of baptism for themselves. No, but on a question where lexicons, philology, versions, fathers, commentators are called in by hundreds, to decide the mode,—on such an issue of judgment, the right to approach the Lord's table is suspended.

2d—But if dipped, still it is not baptism, unless a regenerate believer at the time he was dipped. If he was not regenerate then, was dipped, and afterwards through faith is regenerated, still he eats and drinks damnation to himself, from the Baptist standpoint, for he is not baptized, though dipped.

3d—If dipped, and regenerate, still if not baptized with the proper symbolism, it fails again. They—Baptists—tell us baptism is a door, initiatory rite, represents death to sin, is a profession of faith in Christ, symbolizes the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ, etc. Now, from Dr. Graves' position, if you were not dipped to represent the true import of baptism, you are not scripturally baptized—it is not valid.

4th—If all these points hold good, you are not baptized if it is not for a proper object. If, as the Disciples, for the remission of sins, or as Pedobaptists, to represent regeneration by which our innocence is secured, it is not valid.

4th. If all these points hold good, yet if dipped by one not duly authorized, it is invalid—no baptism. Here is a doubly important point. Here the point becomes fearfully delicate and dangerous. If the administrator failed at his baptism in any one of these five points, he is no true, legitimate minister—has no right to baptize. And if the one by whom he was baptized failed in any one of these five points, he had no authority—it is not valid. You see, therefore, that Dr. Graves' position implies three things—that (1st). Every Baptist minister is omniscient—knows all hearts, that the party is regenerate, has the right intention, symbolism, etc. (2d). That he is ubiquitous—has been present all the way down for 1800 years to know that all the links of the chain by which they claim to run back to the apostles, hold good—all these five conditions hold good in every case in the chain. (3d). That they are infallible in judgment and decision, so that when they make the conditions and set the limits, it is infallibly certain and true.

Now this makes a fearful summing up. Hence if all these hold not good, and who will say the millionth part of them would hold good?—but if they all do not hold good, there is not a Baptist in this house that has the right to commune. Nay more, there is not a Baptist in Carrollton—not in Missouri. Hence every time you Baptists commune, you rebel against Christ, and eat and drink condemnation to your souls! Alas, what a terrible gauntlet you have to run here.

By Dr. Graves' rules, Dr. Ford, Waller, Orchard, and all the authorities here—these editors, unless the baptizer is in the regular line of so-called Apostolic Succession—has his baptism in regular order handed down lineally, by regular succession, from John the Harbinger, he is not baptized, and cannot administer the ordinance validly. But what a wild speculation is this!

To the credit of all the early Baptists in England, Wales and America, this wild and unsubstantial shadow was never dreamed of. Backus, Benedict, Roger Williams, Clark, Knollys, Holmes and Olney, all paid no attention to it: did not believe it. They knew it was wholly untrue and unscriptural. But as our Baptist friends, led on by Dr. Graves, make

it absolutely essential, and all conscience hangs here, let us examine it.

1. Let us look at succession in England: Macaulay says there was not a Baptist congregation or church in England in the sixteenth century. Wall shows that not till the seventeenth century was there a Baptist church in England. There was an Anabaptist congregaton in London in the sixteenth century, but they held such wild notions that the Baptists of the next century would not receive their rites from, or unite with, them. But Benedict, the Baptist historian of greatest repute, not only gives proof of all this, as well as Backus, but says of Mr. Smyth, who for nine years was an Episcopal minister, that he and others went to Holland—Robinson the “father of Independents” being one of the company (328) where they cast him out of the church. * * * These good men, though they had been driven from their native country by persecution entertained very contracted notions of religious liberty. They persecuted Mr. Smyth with the most virulent rancor. The laws of the country in which they had found an asylum, did, indeed, restrain their resentment to words; but they loaded him and his opinions with every kind of reproach, and endeavored to render both his person and doctrine the objects of general abhorrence. [So they do now; so the Baptists loaded the open communion Baptist Bunyan with the epithets, ‘devil,’ ‘anti-christ,’ ‘liar,’ and now Roger Williams is denounced and repudiated by Dr. Graves]. They charged him with many enthusiastic opinions, which they had not been able to prove that he held. They reviled him as a man of a wolfish nature, whom God had struck with blindness; a brute, beast, etc. But these ravings * * reflected more disgrace on themselves than on their adversary,” 328-’29. Those converted to his views, “he formed into a distinct church, chiefly, if not wholly, composed of exiles from his own country. This appears to have been the first Baptist church composed of Englishmen, after the Reformation. It was formed about 1607 or 1608.” Crosby put the first 1633; page 329. Now let us see how many were baptized—where the *succession*. Benedict quotes the facts from Baptist authorities, giving Crosby,

Ivimy's Hist. Eng. Bap., p. 562; Johnson's Chris. Plea, 1617 p. 23, Pagit, etc., as supporting him, no one denying.

"It seems Mr. Smyth and his friends were put to some difficulty in reviving the practice of immersion. He and all his disciples had been sprinkled in their infancy; and therefore, according to their view, were unbaptized. There were, indeed, many churches in Holland, who practiced immersion; but as they differed widely in sentiments from him, he did not choose to receive baptism from them. This completely refuted Dr. Mosheim's supposition, that the English Baptists derived their origin from the German and Dutch Mennonites; and that, in former times they adopted their doctrine in all its points. On the contrary, we see that the first English Baptists of which we have any regular account after the Reformation, although living in the midst of the Dutch Mennonites declined receiving baptism from them on account of their difference of opinions in many important points. * * * This obliged Mr. Smyth to consider of some other means of reviving the ordinance. What method he took, is not very clearly stated. It is most probable, that those who were convinced of believers' baptism first formed themselves into a church [here you see Dr. G.'s idea crushed. These people were all baptized by sprinkling in infancy. Yet first form themselves into a church before being immersed. So they believed; acted—so Benedict believed, and all Baptists then—Dr. G. and his friends go back—recede] and then appointed two of their number (perhaps Mr. Smyth and Mr. Helwisse) to baptize each other, and afterwards baptize the rest; Crosby, vol. 1, p. 85, etc. Benedict, 330. This subject caused considerable uneasiness and reproach to the first Baptists after the Reformation, both General and Particular. A similar difficulty occurred at the formation of the *original* Baptist church in America, by Mr. Roger Williams, who had recourse to the same expedient, (Ivimy's Hist. of Eng. Baptists, p. 562; Benedict, 330), and we shall find in the sequel of this history, that the good men in Leicester shire, in the middle of the last century, when placed in similar circumstances, adopted the same method."

Here we see, 1. In Germany the Anabaptists "restored baptism" by coming out of the Roman church, and immersing each other, when they had been only sprinkled! They state it themselves. 2. The first English Baptists, coming from the Episcopal church, being only sprinkled in infancy, baptize each other. 3. In Leicestershire, they did the same. 4. In America they did the same. There is your Apostolic succession, with a vim!!

Here you see that Dr. Graves' position is utterly crushed. We do not go back into the depths of the ages to snap the chain into a thousand fragments, but right there, in the seventeenth century, where their own historians record the facts, and

we find the crushing exhibition of fact that utterly destroys the last shadow of Dr. Graves' position. No chain is stronger than its weakest link. But here four most essential links part in sunder at once, under Baptist hands.

It is strange, indeed, that Baptists will persist, in the face of such palpable facts, in asserting such medieval claims. After telling us that for "more than five hundred years * * * impenetrable clouds of darkness are spread over the whole history of the whole kingdom [of England] so far as the Baptists are concerned, and no glimpses can be had of any people who bore any resemblance to them;" (p. 305). Benedict at last, p. 450, details how the American Baptists originated.

FIRST CHURCH IN PROVIDENCE.

"This church, which is the oldest of the Baptist denomination in America, was formed in March, 1639. Its first members were twelve in number; viz.: Roger Williams, Ezekiel Holliman, * * Thos. Olney, etc. * As the whole company were in their own estimation, unbaptized, and they knew of no administrator in any of the infant settlements to whom they could apply, they, with much propriety, hit on the following expedient: Ezekiel Holliman, a man of gifts and piety, by the suffrages of the little company, was appointed to baptize Mr. Williams, who, in return, baptized Holliman and the other ten. * * * Any company of Christians may commence a church in gospel order, by their own mutual agreement, without any reference to any other body; and this church has all the power to appoint any one of their number, whether minister or layman, to commence anew the administration of gospel institutions. This is the *Baptist doctrine* of Apostolic Succession, etc.," p. 450.

How does this look along-side of Dr. Graves' positions and modern Baptists? Dr. Backus, who copied the records, lived and wrote over a hundred years ago, confirms all these facts, and so does all history.

Now, then, it is certain, absolutely certain, by these Baptist records, that Baptist ministers, from Dr. Graves' premises, are not ministers by divine authority, have no right to baptize or administer the Lord's Supper, and that there is no Baptist church! You are not a church, from Dr. Graves' standpoint; your baptism is invalid, and you dare not take the Lord's Supper. To such a fearful pass do your premises drive you, by inexorable and remorseless logic!

Let us now examine other points in the communion.

II. In the history of the Lord's Supper, our position is fully

sustained, Dr. Graves' destroyed. The Lord's Supper is a modification, simplification of the Paschal feast, instituted by Moses, (Exodus xii, 3-20) as Christian baptism was the perfection of the baptism from Moses down, till John's ended. This was the Lord's Passover, as "Christ, our Passover, is slain for us." Now,

1. The Passover was instituted before baptism; it being instituted before baptism was named, ordained, hinted or practiced as a religious rite, under the words, "wash," "sprinkle, etc., etc.

2. It was celebrated, eaten, its benefits secured, before baptism was named, or its law (washing, etc.) given. See Exodus xii, 3 to 20, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28—they "went away and did as the Lord had commanded Moses, so did they "

3. Baptism does not occur till Exodus xiv, 1-22 compared with 1st Cor. x, 1-2.

4. It was not formally ordained till Exodus xxix, 4; xxx, 18-22; xl, 30-32; nor administered till Leviticus viii, 6. Here we see that the Lord's Supper had the precedence altogether. went before baptism, instead of coming after it.

III. In the New Testament history of it, the same facts hold good.

1. The Lord's Supper was ordained before Christ was taken or crucified. (Matt. xxvi, 17-28; Luke xxii, 17-21; Mark xiv, 12-21.

2. Christian baptism was never named or hinted, so far as the Bible tells us, till forty days after his resurrection. (Matt. xxvii; 19-21).

3. The Lord's Supper was administered, as above, before the arrest or crucifixion of Christ. Christian baptism was never administered till on the day of Pentecost. (Acts ii, 41-47).

The Lord's Supper was administered by Christ in person. most solemnly; whereas he never baptized personally with water, (John iv, 2), nor did his apostles usually, (Acts x, 48; 1 Cor. i, 15-17), but left it to inferior parties.

5. The Lord's Supper was ordained and administered before there was a church at all, according to Dr. Graves' logic, for he admitted on infant baptism that John the Harbinger did

not organize a church. Well, then, Christ did not personally baptize with or in water. If the apostles were baptized, therefore he admits it was by John. That did not put them into any church, he admits—there was no church then, he says. Now, when did the church rise? How did it originate? Will he tell us? He cannot. As Christ never baptized with water, these apostles, he believes, were baptized by John; yet that did not initiate them into any church—no church is in existence. When and how did they get into the church? You assert that no one can get into the church without Christian (water) baptism. Please settle this enormous difficulty. But you assert that Eph. ii, 15, “makes in himself of twain (of Jews and Gentiles) one new man”—“is a new church.” Not a Gentile was brought in till eight or ten years after Pentecost, nor till eleven years after the sermon on the Mount, where you said the church was organized. Now, (1) how could he organize a church, in your sense of a congregation, visible establishment, officered, etc., and no baptism with which to initiate them, and no congregation but all dispersed and gone in an hour? (2) If the Christian church was established, originated or constituted on the Mount eleven years before Gentiles came in, how came it that he made a new church eleven years afterward? What became of the church made on the Mount? Here we have a Jewish church; it is destroyed by the fiat of the Almighty; a new, real one is established on the Mount, (Matt. v,) yet (1) it is not named or hinted at; (2) no record of it existed—how it originated, when it expired to give way to the new church of Eph, ii, 15. (3) Dr. Graves never has told us, never will, how its members came in. If ever baptized, it was, he admits, by John the baptizer. But he admits that that did not put them into a church, for he says there was no church then. They were regenerated, were baptized, yet in no church. Suddenly they are constituted a church, without any baptism, no officers, no local congregation, nothing to show its existence. He repels infant baptism if it is to be proven by inference, yet here everything—church, membership, the very existence of the whole church are mere inferences without a premise anywhere whence he can draw an inference. There is logic for you!

And this is the tottering, sandy, wretched foundation, as feeble as the baseless fabric of a vision, of all this proscription, intolerance and fanaticism!!!

IV The negative of this proposition is sustained by the only conditions laid down by Christ and the apostles, as prerequisite to taking the Lord's Supper.

1. Nothing in the Lord's Supper, nothing that is a prerequisite to it, necessitates baptism as a prerequisite. He says the Lord's Supper is a church ordinance. Grant it. So is baptism. Yet, is baptism prerequisite to baptism? It is a church ordinance, yet he believes it is altogether administered to parties outside the church, to bring them into the church. So that point utterly fails.

Dr. Graves believes that we are regenerate, pardoned spiritually, partake of Christ's blood, are adopted into his spiritual family, made his sons, heirs, all before we are baptized. Yet not all these exalted privileges and rights entitle us to this one rite! Is not that strange, absurd, and un-Christ-like? We are permitted to spiritually take of Christ's precious blood to eat his spiritual body by faith, yet denied the mere emblems thereof.

2. But Christ and Paul tell us the exact conditions. They are, first, "This do in remembrance of me;" Luke xxii. 19: Cor. xi. 24; second, "Discerning the Lord's body"—same thing. Third, "Let a man examine himself"—not be examined by you, 1 Cor. xi. 28. All these facts, the only ones given save 1 Cor. x. 16, 18, show that baptism is not a pre-requisite to the Lord's Supper. This last passage is confirmatory, strongly, of these facts. It shows, 1st, that all Christians are members of "the church." 2d, that all who "are partakers of that only bread."—Christ—as all Christians are admitted to be by Dr. Graves and all, are entitled to "the communion of the body of Christ"

3. Judas partook of the Lord's Supper. See Mark xiv. 18. 23; Luke xxii. 17-21. "The twelve apostles" are present. "One of you which eateth with me shall betray me." "It is one of the twelve that dippeth with me." And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and break it, and gave to

them, and said, "Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, * * * and they all drank of it." Mark xiv. 23.

This clearly shows that, 1st, Judas partook of it. 2d, Christ left each, professing to be his disciple, to examine himself and so eat, taking on himself the responsibility involved.

If it be insisted that Judas was baptized, as we have all the proof of his baptism that we have of the other eleven apostles, yet was he regenerate? for Dr. Graves does not believe he was saved.

If he was baptized, yet unregenerate, it destroys one of his dogmas and propositions. If he was regenerate, it destroys another proposition Dr. Graves maintains. Either Judas was or was not baptized. If he was baptized, yet lost, Dr. Graves and Baptists are all wrong in requiring regeneration before baptism, as they deny he was regenerate. If he was not baptized, how came he in the church on the Mount? If not baptized, no more were the other eleven.

If he was not regenerate, his baptism was no baptism, by Dr. Graves' position. Any way, therefore, he was not baptized, yet he took the Lord's Supper.

4. The Baptist position is far more fleshly, takes a far more carnal, less Spiritual view of the Lord's Supper than did the ancient Jews of religion, and attaches far more importance than did they in any age, to mere external rites. The first record of a carnal ordinance commanded was circumcision; Gen. xvii. 11-14. A severe penalty, even excommunication, was threatened against every male who failed of it. Yet for forty years it was omitted; Josh. v. 4-8. Aaron even transgressed the law, not eating the sin offering of the people, yet it was allowed; Lev. x. 16-20. Joshua was wroth against Medad and Eldad prophesying in the camp, not first going to the Lord at the tent door of the tabernacle, and wished Moses to forbid such irregularity; Num. xi. 16-26. Yet Moses rebukes him, and prays for more such prophets. In 2 Cor. xxx. 13-27, we learn that the people came to the passover in an undue manner, were not baptized either as the law generally demanded of defiled persons, yet ate it otherwise than was even provided by law, yet in prayer all was sanctioned by the

Lord. David ate the shew-bread against the law, yet Christ commends it. The people took the Lord's passover; Num.x. 6-13, as well as 2 Chron. xxx. 13-27—all ate it together, yet a large part were unbaptized from ceremonial defilement.

Hence we see that even repeated violations of the law were allowed in communion among the Hebrews, yet, now, 1st, where no law can be found to sustain close communion, 2d, where all law is against the Baptist position, we find their consciences so very acute and tender that the ancient Jews show a far superior view of the spirituality of religion and its heavenly toleration, to the Baptists.

5. They say it is a church ordinance, and the parties must be baptized. Suppose we grant all this, yet we are entitled to it. 1st, we baptize all our people. 2d, all Christians are baptized with the Spirit; 1 Cor. xii. 13; Eph. i. 13-14; Rom, vi. 3-4; Acts x. 44-47; xi. 15-17. "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, bond or free." This is the "one baptism" of Eph. iv. 4, 5. 3d, all Methodists, Presbyterians, etc., who are genuine Christians, who love God, are members of Christ's church, and so, from your premises, are entitled to the Lord's Supper.

6 If unbaptized people cannot take the Supper, or administer it, how can unbaptized, unimmersed people administer the capacity for it? 1st, The Baptists in England received the only baptism they have from sprinkled Episcopalians. They never were baptized by immersed parties. Baptist history, English history, all records on the subject show that the English Baptists did not affiliate with or receive baptism from the Anabaptists, but from sprinkled Episcopalians, between 1602 and 1608.

In America, Ezekiel Holliman, who never had been immersed, baptized Roger Williams, and he in turn baptized Holliman and the rest. All the Baptist churches in America receive their baptism thence, save the very few who got it from the equally inconsistent source in England.

These facts we have already presented, and will give fuller details on another proposition. The Baptist rule, as already

quoted from Dr. Graves, is thus laid down in the *Texas Baptist Pulpit*, vol. i. p. 18, 19, 1873 :

"The properly appointed officers of a government alone can administer its laws. Neither Scripture nor reason authorizes us to recognize any man at this day, as an official minister of the gospel, but one appointed to that office by a church of Jesus Christ, nor any pretended administrators of the ordinance of baptism as valid, except those performed by a properly authorized administrator. All others are usurpers and rebels against the government of Christ's church. Truth requires us to view and treat them as such." 265.

Now, by this rule, no Baptist has a right to baptize. He has no right to the Lord's Supper. He has no right to preach. Every Baptist among you eats and drinks damnation to his own soul, every time he approaches the Lord's table. How *dare* you do it? *Why* do you do it? BECAUSE NOT A BAPTIST BELIEVES IT! It will do to proselyte with, agitate, use to unsettle the ignorant, superstitious and unwary, but *no one really* believes it. It is too absurd, narrow, unscriptural, anti-Christian—against letter and spirit—law and gospel—truth and righteousness. It is a relic of superstition, a whim of the bigotry of the dark ages, a hydra-headed moral monster, a usurper and a deformity to Christianity! And to enforce it, they claim an uninterrupted succession from John till now. The baptism of the German Anabaptists was from Roman Catholic priests alone. Munzer was a priest in orders. He had no other baptism. Donatists, through whom Orchard, Ford, and Dr. Graves claim succession, baptized infants, had priests, bishops, confessional, etc., etc., and their baptism was from Rome, and no historian will assert otherwise. They claim succession through the Novatians. Yet their founder, Novatus, they know never was baptized save by sprinkling on his bed, A. D. 251!

Here the chain snaps again. No chain can be stronger than its weakest link. They baptized infants universally also! And these are the links in the chain of Baptist succession. They had bishops, priests, confession, all in the Catholic sense of that day! Our Baptist friends can claim to receive baptism from such sources, and take the communion on such authorities; yet their tender consciences will not let them commune with

men whose virtues, character, and holy influences rise as far above all these as the sun rises above the moon! Alas for consistency!

7. Do you debar all those from communion who fail to do their duty—obey Christ, keep his commands? Alas, you know you do not! Here your inconsistencies are manifest in that, 1st, You exalt the value or utility of a mere external rite far above the great matters of the law—love, faith, purity, charity; yea, above honesty, truth, and right! This is pure Pharisaism? 2d, It assumes that the apostles always promptly, at once, baptized their converts, when all the proof goes to show that they did not, but left it to subordinates. See Acts x. 44-47; I Cor. i. 15-17. There is no record of any one of the twelve apostles ever baptizing any body, and Paul, the added thirteenth apostle, only baptized a few persons.

Let us now notice Dr. Graves' points, though they have all gone down before the overwhelming facts and arguments already adduced:

Whatever Hibbard, etc., may say, our Discipline and Watson, together with the practice of our leading divines, are our only standards of Bible interpretation. Our Discipline reads:

"Ye that do truly and earnestly repent, etc., and are in love and charity with your neighbors, etc., etc., following Christ's holy commandments, draw near by faith."

Watson's Institutes, part iv. chap. iv. p. 735, declares the same:

'All are welcome there who truly love Christ, and all who sincerely desire to love, serve and obey Him. All truly penitent persons: all who take Christ as the *sole foundation of their hope*, etc.'

To all he says there, we fully subscribe.

But Prof. Ripley, than whom there is not a more influential and enlightened Baptist on the Continent, states that we are a church, but not regular: Baptist Library, vol. iii. p. 214. It is remarkable that the greatest Baptist lights in every century of their existence, always have advocated open communion with other Christians. The first founders of the Baptist Church in England, then John Bunyan seventeenth century, Robt. Hall next, and Spurgeon, all were open communionists of the boldest stamp.

Dr Griffin did not hold as Dr. Graves made him. I have

his words here, and he only allowed that each should be allowed to judge for himself if he were baptized. That is vastly different from your position which requires that, 1st, he be baptized; 2d, you to be judge of whether he was or not; 3d, that he be regenerate; 4th, you being judge of his change from his experience; 5th, he must be baptized for a proper object; 6th, you the judge; 7th, he must be baptized with the right symbolism; 8th, you the judge whether it be right symbolism; 9th, by a lawful authority, a Baptist preacher, who was himself, and all his baptizing predecessors, born in Baptist orders, and each and all of them baptized after regeneration, for proper purpose, by right symbolism, by equally valid authority; 10th, you the judge of all this. Each of all these ten conditions must infallibly hold good in the baptism of every Baptist preacher in the line clear back to the apostles!!! Yet no such conditions hold good in any two given links out of the hundreds of thousands that strain it at every link. How weaker than a rope of sand such airy and delusive claims! This claim implies in every Baptist preacher—

1st. Omnipresence—ubiquity. He has to know that these ten conditions hold good in every case for 1800 years. This requires Omnipresence—an attribute of God alone.

2d. That every Baptist preacher be Omniscient—know all the hearts and facts in all cases of their baptisms for 1800 years.

3. That all of them be infallible in judgment. If they blundered, erred, were biased, failed to do as the law requires, all fails, as “no chain is stronger than its weakest link,” How can they know that the conditions hold good in any given case? They cannot, unless omnipresent, infallible—these attributes they do not claim.

Dr. Graves assumes that we give the Supper to those who cannot discern the Lord's body. What is to hinder regenerated, spiritually baptized, adopted sons, from discerning the Lord's body? Are not these things spiritually discerned? Is water baptism necessary to enable us to remember Christ and discern his body? He knows it is not. Why, then, press in such objections that are absolutely nothing? It is because it is the best that can be done. If he had solid arguments, he

would use them. He says I am a bold man. Only so when armed with the panoply of truth. "Thrice is he armed" who hath this as his armor.

We must have "Christian Baptism." Why, the twelve apostles and seventy disciples, and one hundred and twenty disciples never had that. Yet they surely took it. We know the twelve did. Besides, John's baptism was "unto repentance." Is that the object of yours? His was that Christ might be made manifest to Israel; John 1. That is not yours. Yet you say if it is not for the right purpose, with right symbolism, all is invalid, of no force. Worse, and more of it here, all the time.

You send out missionaries and their wives, and these begin by organizing themselves into a church the first thing. Very well. How do they do this? They do not rebaptize each other. Baptism is the door in, you say. How do they now get in? Into what church does baptism put the man baptized? How do these get into a church that has no existence? You deny the existence of the invisible church. You only admit church existence in the local congregation—the visible assembly. When these parties are in transit where is their membership? Do they not hold it alone on the basis we go on—in the invisible church, any members of which can gather themselves together and constitute a valid, visible church with ecclesiastical rights and functions? When these parties are in transit, as a person with a letter, they are not a visible organization. They hold their membership by virtue of being members of "the church," the spiritual family of God. They organize themselves by virtue of the rules of order recognized by the church. These are the facts, and utterly destroy the church theories of our opponents and perfectly sustain our views. Having utterly destroyed your theories, and from the Scriptures completely sustained ours, we cannot but admire the Methodist view as contrasted with yours.

1st. Your view rests upon remote and most strained interpretations, and illegitimate deductions. Ours rests upon the plain word of God—*thus saith the Lord*.

2d. Yours rests upon false records of history, unsupported by a single fact, but contradictory of all the well-established facts of history. Ours stand upon the plain words of inspiration, and are sustained by the whole analogy of faith and vindicated by the spirit and genius of Christianity.

3d. Our views are broad and generous, and tend to harmonize all Christians and bring them into cordial co-operation for the good of all men and the glory of God, while yours tend to alienation, narrow-mindedness, intolerance, proscription and persecution.

4th. Ours alone put us into sympathy with the brotherhood of all ages and all climes—all times and all dispensations. By our view, the church of God, in all ages, all times, all dispensations is One! Unity pervades the entire body, Christ heads the universal brotherhood. When the Methodist, the Presbyterian bows at the altar and receives the communion, he is put into sympathy with the whole family of God, in Heaven and earth; he is in sympathy with a brotherhood as extended as redeemed humanity!

His arms of sympathy and love take in all God's people, of every name, order, clime and country. His warm heart beats in response to the heart of Abel and Lamech; of Enoch and Elijah; of Abraham and Moses—is in sympathetic tendency with those in heaven, and clasps fraternal hands with those beyond the flood. Here is presented a communion that reflects that above. Here *Christ Jesus* is recognized as *the head of all, and in Him all are united, in one. This is Methodism—this is Christianity!*—[Time out.

DR. GRAVES' SECOND SPEECH.

Replication.

MR. PRESIDENT:—Although the time given me to discuss this subject is limited to three hours, I shall devote this half hour in replying to my opponent, although his entire speech is wholly irrelevant to the proposition under discussion, which is, “Christian Baptism is prerequisite to the Lord’s Supper.” This is a question to be settled by the word of God alone. Did Christ appoint it before He did baptism? Did He celebrate it before? Did He give it in His life-time to those baptized or unbaptized? Did the Apostles? Was it invariably celebrated in the church when assembled together as such, or was it offered to the unbaptized, and even to sinners as a “means of grace?” All must see that the invariable order in which we find it observed by the Apostles, and New Testament churches, must be the invariable law to us. But he has turned aside to devote most of his time to an attack upon Baptist history, but it is all he can do.

Now, Mr. President, I ask you what in the name of reason has the question, whether there has been a Baptist church “from the days of John the Baptist until now,” to do with the question under discussion? Suppose John the Baptist had never preached. Suppose there never had been a Baptist church or Methodist Society, what has that do with this question? Suppose Eld. Ditzler could prove that the Baptists originated with those Pedobaptists—the mad men of Munster, or with John Smith or Roger Williams the Se-Baptists—never were baptized originally, or partook of the Lord’s Supper, what possible bearing would those facts, if they really were facts, have upon this question in any way? None whatever. Whether there is, or is not, an open sea around the North Pole has just as much to do with it, and Eld. Ditzler knows it. But his object is apparent, he has consumed his hour in seek-

ing to prejudice you who hear, and those who may read this debate, against Baptists by grossly misstating what they do hold and teach, and misrepresenting their history. How discreditable this in a Christian controversialist! This, Sir, is not honorable discussion, but abuse. I do not say this because there is a page or paragraph in the history of my people of which I am ashamed. No, Sir, her history, let men like Eld. Ditzler, who feel they are called of God to use any means to destroy Baptists from the face of the earth, say what and do what they please, still her history, however darkened, not with crime, but with sorrows and persecutions; or however bright, is the history of the true church of the Lord Jesus. One thing is certain, if churches, *now* known as Baptist, holding *essentially* the same doctrines, administering the same ordinances for the same purpose, and to the same subjects, are not the true churches of Christ, then Christ has never had a church on this earth. This fact is patent upon the pages of inspiration, pronounced by the lips of prophets, and the Son of God Himself, that, whatever the character of the church and kingdom which Christ "set up," or "built" during his personal ministry, that organization was to continue essentially unchanged and pure until he should come again. It was never to be broken in pieces or demolished; from the moment "it was set up it was to stand forever." See Daniel ii. 44 :

"And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed : and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, *but* it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever."

There was to be no originating the kingdom again in subsequent times, nor was it to be prevailed against by corruption any more than by the sword—for, said its DIVINE FOUNDER,

"On this Rock" ["Thou art Christ the Son of the living God"] will I build my church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Matt. xvi. 18.

There was to be no *reforming* this church! to assert that it needed to be "set up" again or drawn out of the bosom of the Man of Sin and *reformed* in morals and manners, is to stamp the declaration of the prophets, of Christ and the Apostles, with falsehood. The corrupt organization known in history as the Greek Catholic Church could not have been this church for it

was originated in the third and fourth centuries. It could not have been the Roman or Western Catholic Church known as the Papacy first originated in A. D. 606-10. It could not have been the organizations that Luther or Calvin or Henry VIII, set up, for they originated in the sixteenth century and were cut off from, and reformed out of the Papacy. Much less could it have been Methodism, for such a system never was known to the world before the days of John Wesley, and never presumed to assume the name of church before 1784.

You have heard Elder Ditzler's assertions touching the origin and history and succession of Baptists. I will take time to read you the statements of scholars and historians who know whereof they affirmed, and though Pedobaptists, candid and honest enough to confess the truth.

I will introduce the testimony of the most distinguished Catholic of his day, Cardinal Hosius, President of the Council of Trent—(A. D. 1550).

"If the truth of religion were to be judged of by the readiness and cheerfulness which a man of any sect shows in suffering, then the opinion and persuasion of no sect can be *truer* and *surer* than that of Anabaptists [Baptists,] since there have been *none, for these twelve hundred years past, that have been more generally punished*, or that have more cheerfully and steadfastly undergone, and even offered themselves to, *the most cruel sorts* of punishment, than these people."

"The Anabaptists are a pernicious sect, of which kind the Waldensian brethren seem also to have been. Nor is this heresy a modern thing, for it existed in the time of Austin."—*Reese's Reply to Wall*, p. 20.

I will introduce a Lutheran Historian, Mosheim, who was as much opposed to Baptists as my opponent. His history is a standard work and republished by the Methodist book concern, and it is made a text-book for Methodist ministers. He says—

"The true origin of that sect which acquired the name of Anabaptists, by their administering anew the rite of baptism to those who came over to their communion, and derived that of Mennonites from that famous man to whom they owe the greatest part of their *present felicity*, IS HID IN THE REMOTE DEPTHS OF ANTIQUITY, and is, consequently, extremely difficult to be ascertained."—Vol. iv, pp. 427, 8, Macklaine's Edition of 1811.

Again: "It may be observed that the Mennonites are not entirely mistaken when they boast of their descent from the Waldenses, Petrobrusians, and other *ancient sects* who *were* usually considered as witnesses of the truth, in the times of universal darkness and superstition. Before

the rise of Luther and Calvin, there lay, *concealed* [this looks like a fulfillment of the Revelation, where we find the woman driven into the wilderness—i. e., obscurity!] in almost all the countries of Europe, particularly in Bohemia, Moravia, Switzerland, and Germany, many persons who adhered tenaciously to the following doctrines, which the Waldenses, Wickliffites and Hussites, [we do not feel reproached by association with such spirits,] had maintained, some in a more disguised, and others in a more public manner, viz.: "That the kingdom of Christ, or the visible Church he had established upon earth, was an assembly of true and real saints, and ought, therefore, to be inaccessible to the wicked and unrighteous, and also exempt from all those institutions which human prudence suggests, to oppose the progress of iniquity, or to correct and reform transgressors."

This is a frank admission that the Waldenses, as well as the Wickliffites, were opposed to *infant* baptism and Church membership, since they admitted none but "*real saints*." into the visible Church, and that they—as Baptists have ever been—were opposed to a religion of *force and persecution*.

I will quote the testimony of Zwingle, a Presbyterian, the co-laborer of Calvin—who opposed Baptists with pains and penalties, even unto death—

"The institution of Anabaptism is no novelty, but for thirteen hundred years has caused great disturbance in the Church, and has acquired such a strength, that the attempt in this age to contend with it, appeared futile for a time."

This carries the succession of Baptists back to the year A. D. 225!

Finally I will quote the impartial testimony of those two distinguished scholars, Dr. Ypeig, Professor of Theology, at Groningen, and Rev. J. J. Dermout, Chaplain to the King of Holland, who were appointed by the King to write the History of the Reformed Church of the Netherlands that was published in 1819. These men were qualified for the task, and they had "access to all the libraries and archives of Germany." They knew whether the Baptists originated in Germany in the sixteenth century, with John Smyth or the Munsterites. They devoted one chapter to a brief history of the Baptists—and I quote, from the conclusion of that chapter, the result of their investigation.

"We have now seen that the Baptists, who were formerly called Anabaptists, and in later times Mennonites, were the original Waldenses, and who have long, in the history of the Church, received the honor of that

origin. ON THIS ACCOUNT, THE BAPTISTS MAY BE CONSIDERED THE ONLY CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY WHICH HAS STOOD SINCE THE APOSTLES, AND AS A CHRISTIAN SOCIETY WHICH HAS PRESERVED PURE THE DOCTRINE OF THE GOSPEL THROUGH ALL AGES. The perfectly correct external economy of the Baptist denomination, tends to confirm the truth disputed by the Romish Church, that the Reformation brought about in the sixteenth century was in the highest degree necessary; and at the same time goes to refute the erroneous notions of the Catholics, that their communion is the most ancient." See *Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Art. MENNONITES;" also, the "Southern Baptist Review," Vol. v, No. 1, Art. 1, for full translation of the Chapter.†

Now, which will you believe, Eld. Ditzler's unqualified assertions, or Cardinal Hosius, Zwingli, Mosheim, and these distinguished men? If these witnesses tell the truth, and no unprejudiced man will question it, all can see that Baptists, by whatever name they were called, never derived their baptism nor succession from Rome, or any of her family—and that the declaration of Sir. Isaac Newton is true, that "the Baptists are the only people that never symbolized with the Papacy." We repudiate Apostolic succession, a doctrine so dear to the Episcopacy, for the Apostles never had successors, but we do, and have a right to claim *church* succession; *i. e.*, that, in the language of these historians, ours is the only Christian community that has stood since the days of the Apostles, and has during all these ages, preserved pure the doctrines of the Gospel until this day. This is what we do claim, a continuity of churches, and if our claim is not good, history nor the Bible itself can be credited.

It is not true that historical Baptists formerly, before the days of the Reformation, called Anabaptists, were one and the same with the German Anabaptists or Munsterites that arose in the sixteenth century. Their enemies sought to put this shameful slander upon them; but what say Drs. Ypeig and Dermout. Speaking of the Munsterites, they call them Protestants—*i. e.*, Pedobaptists, who left Rome under the lead of the Reformers. Baptists never were Protestants. They say: "These Protestants are known in history by the name of Anabaptists, and ought, by no means to be considered the same as the Baptists." If any one wishes to examine Eld. Ditzler's assertions touching our

† All these quotations can be found in "Trilemma." By J. R. Graves.

baptism, originating with, or having any connection with John Smyth's, or that the only baptism the English Baptists had, was sprinkling, derived from the Episcopal church, or that of American Baptists, from Roger Williams, I refer them to "Baptist Succession," a work compiled from reliable authorities, by D. B. Ray of this State; and to Adlam's First Baptist Church in America, to Orchard's, and Ivey's history of English Baptists and to Jones' History of the Church. The charges of Eld. Ditzler are unsupported by reliable history. John Smyth never was connected with any Baptist church in his life, and no Baptist church with him. Roger Williams never was a Baptist, never was connected with any Baptist church, and no Baptist church existing on earth to-day, ever had any connection with him, or his baptism. I know what I say, and I believe that you who hear me this day, believe me when I say it. I have never yet failed to make good my assertions, and can prove it against any man or angel affirming it. Having repelled, with historical facts, the aspersions cast upon my people by my opponent, I now return to the discussion of the question. It should be known that the historical, as well as the Scriptural claims of my church were offered by the Baptist Committee to be discussed, but declined, and the claim of the Baptist church in this place, and every other one like it, to be a Scriptural church, were conceded by the Methodist Committee in writing. Then we not only have a Scriptural organization, polity, and membership, but Scriptural ordinances also. What more?

I thank him for introducing so much excellent matter from the paper I edit, and the Texas Baptist. Every orthodox Baptist in the land will endorse the sentiments. Without a Scriptural baptism, no one can be a member, much less a minister of Christ's church, and no act is Scriptural save that of immersion by an authorized *officer*, and with the proper *design*; and I freely accept all the consequences of the position.

It does not follow that if the officer who immersed me, was in fact, whether known or unknown to himself, an unregenerate man, that therefore my baptism is null, any more than my marriage would be, or the acts of a County Clerk, or Judge,

of any Court; the question is, was he a legally authorized officer? The baptisms of Judas, before he fell, were as valid as those of Peter, because he was a duly authorized officer. And Judas was a baptized person, though I don't believe he partook of the Supper. It was after he received the sop that he went immediately out, and the sop was eaten in connection with the Passover, and not the supper. John iii. 3

It is the Church that baptizes through her servants. It is her duty to select, so far as she can ascertain, pious ministers, and those who are legitimate church members, and her responsibility ceases. The candidate is required to apply to a Scriptural Church; and receiving baptism at the hands of *its officer*, with that the subject's responsibility in the matter ends. If he goes to a Masonic Lodge, or a Methodist Society, and accepts its initiatory rite instead, however honest he may be, he has not been baptized, nor is he a member of Christ's Church.

It is not left by the King in Zion to the subject, to select any act for Christian baptism he pleases; that's a fatal mistake. Suppose one should choose to have the water poured or sprinkled on his *toe* or foot, would that be baptism? Eld. Ditzler has once in this debate said no. Nor does Christ require his ministers to be omniscient, to *know* the heart, but he does command them to require, in every case, a *profession* of personal faith and regeneration, and when Baptists say this, they say no more than does the Methodist Society, through her standards, whatever scorn Eld. Ditzler may seek to heap upon us for so doing. He thereby inveighs against his own church.

Before I develop the law of the Supper laid down by Paul, I will briefly notice a few points in Eld. Ditzler's speech.

1. He affirms that "the Lord's Supper is a modification and simplification of the Paschal Feast instituted by Moses." He means by this that the Lord's Supper was substituted in room and place of the Jewish Passover, as most Pedobaptists hold and teach—and which Eld. Ditzler held until driven from it and compelled to surrender—that Christian baptism comes in the place of circumcision, therefore, it follows that when the substitute came in force those rites for which they were sub-

stituted were forever abolished. Now the unscripturalness of this position can be seen from the fact that both circumcision and the Jewish Passover were appointed to be ordinances to be observed by the Jews "*forever*." "Forever," in its lowest acceptation, while time is—while any part of eternity is measured—certainly did not cease when Christian baptism was instituted, or there would have been no time in which the Supper could have been instituted or observed! We are conscious that time still is with us; "forever" has in no sense expired, and therefore, both circumcision and the Jewish Passover are still scripturally in force and enjoined by Almighty authority upon the same people to be observed to-day as in the days of Moses and Christ. He observed both. His apostles and all the Jewish Christians observed both. They were never abolished by Christ nor His apostles. Paul protested against the perversion of circumcision, i. e. its observance as a work of righteousness for their justification before God, but he never, in all his ministry, taught the Jews, whether Christians or not, to abstain from circumcising their children as God had commanded Abraham to do. Did he not circumcise Timothy with his own hands? Did he not go into the Temple with shaven head, be at charges with four men who had a vow, in order to prove to the Jews and his brethren at Jerusalem that he had not at any time taught the Jews that they ought not to circumcise their children?—See Acts xxi. 17–31

The Jews still rightly observe both these ordinances, and we Gentiles are not entitled to either. His first position therefore is groundless. It is to Judaize Christianity, to seek to incorporate the old Jewish economy and its rights and ordinances with it, and foist them into the Christian Church.

The Paschal Feast was appointed by God to be a memorial to the Jews—but to no other nation—forever.

"And this day shall be unto you for a MEMORIAL: and ye [not Gentiles] shall keep it a feast to the Lord throughout your generations: ye shall keep it a feast by ordinance FOREVER." Ex. 12-14.

It is therefore a living ordinance unto this day with them, as is the rite of circumcision, which was commanded to be observed by Abraham's seed forever—to a thousand generations, and it is as much their duty to observe it to-day as it was

then, and they do observe it, as they do the Passover as a memorial of their preservation when the first born of Egypt were destroyed, and of their deliverance from their bondage in the land of Egypt.

2. His next statement was "the Passover was instituted before baptism." If he means Christian Baptism, or Proselyte Baptism for which he says Christian Baptism was substituted, I agree with him, but I protest against his denominating the sprinklings and pourings of the ceremonial law, "*baptisms*"—*i. e.*, Christian Baptisms, for I demonstrated by God's Word and the most eminent authorities in the discussion of the first proposition that they were not designated by the Holy Spirit "*baptisms*"—he shall not take exposed and exploded positions for granted *now*. The only immersion in the history of the Jews that Paul refers to as baptism and type of the Christian, was when the fathers of the Jewish nation were immersed unto Moses, not in or by water but, "in the *cloud* and in the *sea*"—the sea on each side and the cloud a covering over head. This was the consummating act of their actual deliverance from "the house of bondage" and was a part of what was to be commemorated in the Memorial Passover. The feast was never fully kept according to the prescribed law of it until they reached the land of Canaan: it was but once partially observed in the Wilderness. See Num. 28.

3. His next position is that "the Lord's Supper was instituted before Christian Baptism, that "Christian Baptism was not named, so far as the Bible tells us, or hinted at till forty days after Christ's resurrection!" Let all notice this, that the baptism which Christ instituted, and ordained his Harbinger to administer is not Christian—of Christ! That the baptism Christ himself received was not *Christian* Baptism; not of Christ, not commanded by Christ for us to observe when he says follow me! That the baptism his eighty-two ordained ministers preached and administered under his own eye for three and one half years was not Christian Baptism—not authorized and approved by Christ! That the baptism which the Apostles received, unless they rejected the counsel of God against their

own souls as did the Scribes and Pharisees, was not Christian Baptism ! That the baptism which Christ commanded no longer to be confined to Judea and the Jews, but to be preached and administered to believers in Him among all nations, was not Christian Baptism ! It is not true that he *de novo* instituted baptism when he gave the commission, but only commanded the baptism his Apostles had been administering to believers for three and a half years, to be extended to the Gentiles, as the latest ripest Pedobaptist scholars confess. See Alford *in loco*. Must that not be a desperate cause, must not that be a pernicious system, that needs to blot Gospel, Christian baptism out of the records of the four Evangelists—and unbaptize not only the Apostles, but the Son of God himself ! You might, with as little sinfulness—*profanity*—for it is nothing less than profaning Christ himself, to thus pronounce his baptism unchristian, null and void—reject the rest of the Gospel recorded by the Evangelists, as the baptism of Jesus by John : for Mark, inspired by the Holy Ghost, declares the baptism of John to be “the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God.” We have heard of “extremes meeting.” Here my opponent strikes hands with his Campbellite brethren, in opposing the Baptists. Christ’s baptism by John is set at nought, and mocked by their “men of war,” and sent back to this modern Prelate, and this self-same day they will be made friends, and the next thing you will hear they, even Methodists and Campbellites, who have been for the last thirty years cutting each others throats, will set down and feast and fellowship together !

DR. DITZLER'S SECOND REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—Doctor Graves seeks to offset our argument by saying “Baptism and the Lord’s Supper are in the church.”

Now, 1. How could the Lord’s Supper be so placed, when he says the “new man” of Ephesians xi. 15, 16, was the “new church?” This composition of Gentiles and Jews in one new body was conditioned in Christ’s death, and not an *actual* existence till from eight to ten years after Christ’s death. Hence, as Gentiles, were not “brought in,” not incorporated in the church till after eight years had elapsed *from* Pentecost, this church did not exist till eight to ten years *after* the supper was instituted.

Suppose we grant it is *in* the church. He says “*baptism and the Lord’s Supper are in the church.*” But he and all immersionists hold that baptism is administered *to bring people into the church*. Hence it is administered to those not in the church. If the one is in the church—baptism—yet *exclusively* administered to those outside of the church, surely it shows the other, though in the church, can be administered to people who *are in the spiritual* church, yet not identified with a visible organization of it.

Succession. Wall, so accurate and pains-taking in all things, and candid, vol. i. pp. 527–8, Oxford Ed., in two volumes, shows that in the sixteenth century there was not a Baptist church in England. He tells us of the pernicious principles held by a congregation of Anabaptists, who settled about London in the times of Elizabeth—last half of the sixteenth century, but differing widely from Baptists, and when, in the seventeenth century, Baptist churches were organized, they would not receive baptism from those Anabaptists. Dr. Backus shows that the first Baptist ministers in England withdrew from the English church, 1, 90, Benedict 326, 327.

In America, as in England, the Baptists did not receive their baptism from any other church. We gave you the account of it given by the Baptist historians, Backus, vol. i. 102, 103, Benedict, 450, Cramp, 461. They introduced baptism themselves. Dr. Ford, p. 114, 115, and Dr. Graves in his paper, recently, as well as here, ignores the real origin of their church, and claim that John Clark organized their church in America, as if it had any historic basis, or bettered the case. Benedict, Backus, Cramp, and many historians they cite, all show that Roger Williams originated it, and that Clark never organized his till 1644. Benedict, 462-3, Backus, i. 102-3, Cramp, 461. Now, then, in England, Benedict and Cramp both agree that the baptism of Smyth, Helwys, etc., originated just as did that of Holliman and Roger Williams. They were all Episcopalians. They had not been immersed. Nor did they recognize the right of the Episcopal church to baptize, and they had been baptized in infancy of course. So they baptize each other. Here is Benedict's account:

"It seems that Mr. Smyth and his friends were put to some difficulty in reviving the practice of immersion. He and all his disciples had been sprinkled in their infancy; and therefore, according to their new views, were unbaptized. There were, indeed many churches in Holland, who practiced immersion; but, as they differed widely in sentiments from him, he did not choose to receive baptism from them. This completely refutes Dr. Mosheim's supposition, that the English Baptists derived their origin from the German and Dutch Mennonites; and that, in former times, they adopted their doctrine in all its points. On the contrary, we see that the first English Baptists of which we have any regular account after the Reformation, although living in the midst of the Dutch Mennonites, declined receiving baptism from them on account of their difference of opinions in many important points. 'The foreign Anabaptists,' says Crosby, 'were such as denied Christ's having taken flesh of the Virgin Mary, the lawfulness of magistracy, and such like, which Mr. Smyth and his followers looked upon as great errors; so that they could not be thought by him proper administrators of baptism. This obliged Mr. Smyth to consider of some other means of reviving the ordinance. What method he took is not very clearly stated. It is most probable, that those who were convinced of the duty of believers' baptism first formed themselves into a church, and then appointed two of their number (perhaps Mr. Smyth and Mr. Helwys), to baptize each other, and afterwards to baptize the rest. This subject caused considerable uneasiness and reproach to the first Baptists after the Reformation, both General and Particular. A similar difficulty occurred at the formation of the original Baptist church

in America, by Mr. Roger Williams, who had recourse to the same expedient; and we shall find in the sequel of this history, that the good men in Leicestershire, in the middle of the last century, when placed in similar circumstances, adopted the same method."—*Hist. of the Bap.* pp. 329-330.

Dr. Cramp states, "There has been much dispute respecting the manner in which they proceeded, some maintaining that Smyth baptized himself and then baptized the others. It is a thing of small consequence Baptists do not believe in apostolic succession, as it is commonly held. But the probability is, that one of the brethren baptized Mr. Smyth, and that he then baptized the others. The number of these brethren soon increased greatly. A church was formed, of which Mr. Smyth was chosen pastor. At his death, which took place in 1611, Mr. Thomas Helwys was appointed in his place. In the above-mentioned year, before Mr. Smyth's death, the church published a Confession of Faith, in twenty-six articles.—*Bap. His.* p. 287.

Thus you see there is an end of the chain there. But in Germany, their succession breaks again. The baptism of all the Anabaptists was from the Catholics, Munzer, Stork, and all their followers, and Menno, were all Catholics, and the only baptism they had was at the hands of Rome; Munzer was a Roman priest in orders. But the community of Baptists that Smyth and Helwys founded, were *General Baptists*, who afterwards ran into Socinianism and declined in morals. But others of them lapsed into Arianism as Dr. Cramp testifies "Arianism had crept in among them." etc.—*Hist. of the Bap.* pp. 498-9.

Benedict records p. 335—"Towards the close of the seventeenth century, a portion of the members of the General Baptist community began to incline to a much more lax system of theology, which in the end spread widely among the people, and carried a considerable portion of them over to the Unitarian, or as it was then denominated, Socinian side."

But the Calvinistic wing is the branch of the church, which Dr. Graves professes to connect with, rather, in their succession theories. But they were open communionists.

"This church followed the open communion plan for a number of years, but a portion of the members becoming dissatisfied with the system, by mutual agreement, the Baptists eventually went off by themselves."

Dr. Cramp thus relates it: "In the year 1633 an event occurred which requires specific notice. This was the formation of the first Particular or Calvinistic Baptist Church in England. Hitherto the Baptists favored the Arminian views. William Kiffin gives the following account: "There was a congregation of Protestant Dissenters of the Independent persuasion in London, gathered in the year 1616, whereof Mr. Henry Jacob was the first pastor, and after him succeeded Mr. John Lathorp, who was their

minister at this time. In this society several persons, finding that the congregation kept not to their first principles of separation, and being also convinced that baptism was not to be administered to infants, but to such only as professed faith in Christ, desired that they might be dismissed from that communion, and allowed to form a distinct congregation, in such order as was most agreeable to their own sentiments. The church, considering that they were now grown very numerous, and so more than could in those times of persecution conveniently meet together, and believing also that those persons acted from a principle of conscience, and not obstinacy, agreed to allow them the liberty they desired, and that they should be constituted a distinct church; which was performed the 12th of September, 1633. And as they believed that baptism was not rightly administered to infants, so they looked upon the baptism they had received in that age as invalid; whereupon most or all of them received a new baptism. Their minister was Mr. John Spilsbury."—*Bap. His.* pp. 302-3.

Here now their baptism was evidently just like all the rest, *self constituted*. They all believed and held to the same position to which we all assent.

Those who wish to see the views set forth by Orchard, 51, 54, 55; Ford, 144-5; Waller, in his "Baptists not Protestants," issued by Dr. Graves, utterly riddled—that wish to see the utter visionary character of them, let him read Giesler's Ecclesiastical History, Vol. i. pp. 254, 258. Mosheim, 100, 101; Wall, 1, 161, 411, just as samples. These Donatists, claimed as Baptists, were the first professed Christians that ever brought a religious question before a civil magistrate—see Giesler 1, p. 258; Mosheim, 100-1.

But not only did these parties—so called Baptists—lead the way in bringing ecclesiastical matters before Monarchs, Constantine the Great, but they opposed the Reformation, the Anabaptists, with all of their zeal and frenzy. Benedict, quoting Orchard, says, on p. 81:

"He [Luther] and his colleagues had now to dispute their way with *hosts of Baptists all over Germany, Saxony, Thuringia, Switzerland, and other kingdoms*, for several years. Conferences on baptism were held in different kingdoms, which continued from 1516 to 1527. The support which the Baptists had from Luther's writings, *made the reformer's efforts of little effect.*"

Yes, they managed to nullify a vast amount of good, and brought the Reformation to a complete pause, and it has never advanced beyond that point.

Dr. Graves has said "There can be no baptism if the design

be perverted." Well, now look at the design Dr. Graves sees in it and test it by Scripture.

1. Dr. Graves and the Baptists hold that baptism is designed to *initiate* people into the church. But this (1) is nowhere in the Bible; (2) against all that is in the Bible on Baptism; (3) it is against reason; (4) it is utterly against the practice of all churches. So you have no baptism by your own showing.

2. You teach that it is symbolic of the death of Jesus Christ. He died on the cross—how can a dip into living water symbolize such a death?

3. They hold it to be symbolic of the *burial* of Christ, as if a *dip* into and out of water could symbolize burial.

4. They hold that it symbolizes Christ's resurrection. Never did baptism symbolize such a thing, though it had existed 1500 years. Jonah alone symbolized that, and *no other* sign of it was to be given.

5. But the baptism has to come in the line of *succession*. They must be in the regular line. Notice that. But from Tertullian's day A. D. 190, till the fourth century, *all* immersions were by *three* dips, whose symbolism was *the Trinity*, and *nothing else*. They held it as initiative, but its symbolism was *the Trinity*, and they tell us so. See Sozomen's full history of it. So where is the succession here? For three hundred years there was *no* baptism according to this position.

But John's was "*unto repentance*." Is yours so now? So his was not with the proper symbolism. Do you not see how utterly his propositions fail all the way through?

Dr. Graves urges that there is one loaf representing Christ, etc. That is true. So we are *all one in him*, and have this unity of the faith, Eph. iv. 13. We are "*one body in Christ*," not in local forms of government and dogmas. See Rom. xii. 4, 5; I Cor. xii. 12, 13; Eph. i. 21, 22; ii. 13-22; I Cor. x. 17.

As to Catholics, Episcopalians, Mormons, etc., whom he named, have they the same one baptism? the same government?

Now let us notice how the Baptists stand. In England they are divided into General Baptists who were the first Baptists organized. Then 1633 the Particular or Calvinistic Baptists

started up and made a creed as Calvinistic as ever was known. Besides what we have quoted, Cramp, p. 392, tells us again of "Spilsbury, the pastor of the first Particular or Calvinistic Baptist church." "His signature is fixed to the Confession of Faith, published in 1646." Some Baptists, like Ford, take up Knollys, and pretend that *he* figured in a *first* church movement. Benedict says of him, he "landed and tarried awhile in Boston in 1638," p. 369. He had been "ordained by the bishop of Peterborough," and was not yet immersed in 1636. He was judged "to be an Antinomian," left there, preached "at Dover" upwards of three years." Because he so preached, Mather denominates him an Anabaptist. As he came over an Episcopalian, and Roger Williams could find no one to immerse him but one sprinkled, and left Massachusetts because of persecutions as well as Clark in the same year of 1638, how and where did Knollys get immersed? The plain truth is—all these Baptists—for he became one in time—Smyth, Helwys, Knollys, Roger Williams, Holliman, John Clark, Olney, Wickenden, just as *now* all their greatest lights, and as Benedict, Backus, Randall, Cramp hold, held that to "*restore* baptism," they could baptize each other, though sprinkled.

But did you notice that Dr. Graves all the time, so quotes the Scriptures as to make Presbyterians, Episcopalians and Methodists reprobates? He is compelled to do so to prove up his case. Did you notice that all the Scriptures he quotes are those describing the vilest wretches, open reprobates—fornicators, liars, and all that class of men! Now this is the very style that Howell, the Baptist pulpit, and Baptist writers in the "Baptist Library" indulge in constantly. It has always struck us as astonishing.

As to the Passover, being a family affair, that has no point here; for Christ, our Passover, is *one*, the bread is one. We are *one* bread. That was a necessity. The leaven of sin must be rooted out, but *baptizing* is not the means. That establishes us—if *sin* be rooted out—the *heart* be pure, there is the Scriptural qualification. He says Roger Williams had no successor—that his church did not last four months! Now

"Chad. Brown was chosen his successor" because he had to go to England to procure a charter. Benedict, 450-451; Cramp, 461; Backus, I. 102-3, Knowles, professor in Newton Theological Institution, etc. Wickenden "was ordained by Mr. Brown." Benedict, 451. This Brown was baptized by Williams—was among the first that joined him. Backus, I. 102-3. Olney succeeded to the charge, and served till 1682. Baptist writers are a little confused as to just when Olney took charge—Backus putting him immediately after Williams. But were it all a huge Baptist blunder, we know it helps not the case, since Olney, Brown, Wickenden, Clark, and all got their baptism thence. And as late as 1688, there were only thirteen Baptist churches in America, as Benedict, Backus, and Cramp show, and in 1740, after one hundred years, there were only thirty-seven Baptist churches in America, "with less than three thousand members." As for Clark, a sprinkled congregationalist, he never organized a church till 1644, as all authorities show. This will do now.

We need not repeat what has been gone over. These are the facts in your way. Smith and Helwys founded your Baptist church. They baptized each other. Spilsbury founded the Calvinistic wing. Whence came his baptism, we have no light, and Baptists deplore this fact. Roger Williams founded those in America—being himself only sprinkled. John Clark founded the next at Newport, 1644, being sprinkled himself. Knollys tried to get up a Baptist church in sentiment, being only "sprinkled in infancy." Such was the rise of Baptists. Dr. Graves' wing of the Baptist church is not sixty years old yet. Such Baptists as *he* leads, the world never knew of till in *this century*. Hence—*under which king?* is very appropriate here. By *your position*, then, there is not a Baptist in *Missouri*: None of you have been baptized. You have no right to the Lord's Supper. To be consistent, you dare not approach the table. If you believed your doctrine really—had substantial confidence in it, you would not approach that table—*no, never*. —[*Time out.*

DR. GRAVES' THIRD SPEECH.

MR. PRESIDENT :—I now resume my argument where I closed when I sat down. This question has a twofold aspect. It not only may mean an unbaptized Christian, but an unbaptized *sinner* as well.

1. A sinner, a confessedly unregenerate person, young or old, cannot be baptized by the authority of Christ, as I have demonstrated in the discussion of the last proposition, and shall still more fully prove under the fifth, yet to be discussed, and therefore such a one cannot scripturally be made a member of a Christian Church, and consequently cannot partake of the Supper. This seems to me conclusive.

But an unregenerate person has never by faith, "discerned" Christ, nor could he, if baptized and brought into the church and to the Supper "discern the Lord's body," and he would therefore eat and drink condemnation to his own soul.

"For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." 1 Cor. xi, 29.

That soul alone, that is "born from above," quickened and made alive by the Holy Spirit, that has been brought into a peaceful, joyful union with Christ, and made to feel his love shed abroad in his heart, can "see," comprehend the teachings of the Spirit and the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God, or the nature of that Kingdom. Christ plainly taught this fact to Nicodemus when he said—

"Except a man be born again, from above, he cannot see *i. e.* discern the Kingdom of God."

2. Paul declared the same great, but so much—misunderstood, doctrine to the Church at Corinth.

"Howbeit we speak wisdom among them that are perfect: yet not the wisdom of this world, nor of the princes of this world, that come to nought: but we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, *even* the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory; which none of the princes of this world knew: for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. But as it is written, Eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which

God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed *them* unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual. But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know *them*, because they are spiritually discerned. But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man. For who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct him? But we have the mind of Christ." 1 Cor. ii, 6-16.

The terms "judgeth" and "judged" in the fifteenth is the same word in the Greek as "discerned" in the fourteenth verse, *anakrinai*, and should be translated "discerned" to preserve the sense, *i. e.*, "But he that is spiritual discerneth all things, yet he himself is discerned by no man," *i. e.*, merely *natural* man, which the Christian is not. The unbaptized or baptized sinner, the unquickened man, cannot discern Christ as Savior, in his office as Redeemer, Priest and King, cannot discern the glorious system of salvation by grace, cannot discern the visible kingdom, cannot discern His doctrines—justification, regeneration, sanctification, adoption, glorification—cannot in any respect discern the Lord's body in the celebration of the Supper, and therefore cannot but eat and drink condemnation to his own soul. And it does seem to me that these teachers, professed ministers of Christ, who mislead him by their false teaching and influence him to partake, and thus profane the Sacred Feast, must bring down the condemnation of Christ upon their own souls. If they themselves are indeed "spiritual," must they not see, discern, that the unregenerate are wholly disqualified to rightly partake of the Supper, and see and know from the plain teachings of the Word of God that such characters are positively forbidden to participate, and that they themselves are forbidden to invite them to partake of it.

The entire symbolism of the Supper as I have already shown forbids their participation, and it can be still more clearly shown in my next and last argument.

VI. EACH LOCAL CHURCH IS MADE THE GUARDIAN OF THE PURITY OF THE LORD'S SUPPER, AND IS COMMANDED TO PERMIT NO "LEAVEN" TO BE PRESENT AT ITS CELEBRATION.

In the church at Corinth was a Christian man, a lately converted heathen, but incestuous. The sinfulness of this act had not duly impressed him. He may have had influential relations, or strong personal friends in the church, or otherwise he might have been so excellent a man that the church did not act upon his case, and Paul used the authority of an Apostle, adjudged the case, and in the name of the Lord Jesus commanded that such an one should be immediately excluded, before another supper should be celebrated, and he lays down a general rule for the regulation of the Supper by his churches for all future time.

"Your glorying is not good. Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump? Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us. Therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened *bread* of sincerity and truth. I wrote unto you in an epistle not to company with fornicators. Yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world, or with the covetous, or extortioners, or with idolaters; for then must ye needs go out of the world. But now I have written unto you not to keep company if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner, with such a one no not to eat. For what have I to do to judge them also that are without? do not ye judge them that are within? But them that are without God judgeth. Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person."—I Cor. 5.

He refers to the *Passover* as a type of *Christ*, and incidentally of the Supper as analagous to that memorial feast, *that this* like *that*, must be strictly kept, observed according to the expressed law laid down to govern it—that nothing answering to "leaven" must be allowed in connection with it. My opponent's reference to the Paschal Feast and the analogy he sought to institute between it and the Lord's Supper, in my opinion was the only semblance of an argument bearing upon this question, that occurred in his hour's speech. If I understand the teaching of Paul in the above passage, Eld. Ditzler could have chosen no analogy more fatal to *his* individual theory, that the unregenerate as well as the regenerate, the unbaptized sinner

as well as the baptized saint, is equally entitled to partake of the Lord's Supper.

The Paschal Feast was not a national, nor a social, but a family ordinance. It was to be observed by the families of Israel, in their generations forever, as a *memorial*, not a means of grace and personal salvation. The feast was placed under the control of the master, the head of the family, to be observed, not by laws that seemed good unto him, but by those specifically appointed by God. Let this be remembered. It was not *his supper* but the "Lord's Passover," and he as a faithful, God-fearing servant must keep it according to the law of God, no matter who might call him a selfish bigot and an illiberal sectarian. We learn from this—

1. *He could not, without violating the Divine law of the Passover, spread the feast in his own house with open doors, giving no invitation—i. e., prescribing no conditions, but permitting all who deemed themselves fit to come and partake.*

He could not alienate the responsibility Jehovah laid upon him personally, to see that the feast was observed in its purity according to the law of his God. He was to know if there was any uncircumcised one in his own family, and he was to judge if there was any leaven in his house or brought by any member of his own family to the feast. And in like manner he must judge if his neighbor's family whom he invited, was circumcised, or was bringing leaven with it to the feast spread in his house, and under his supervision.

This loose and irresponsible way of setting the Lord's Supper, as it were out upon the common, with the simple announcement, "Supper's ready," as the "liberals" of Brooklyn do, or preparing it and leaving it open to all without any announcement whatever, as Mr. Sawtelle, of San Francisco does, is to profane the Sacred Feast.

A Jew, merely because he was a Jew, had no right to go into any Jewish house he pleased to celebrate the Passover with any other family than his *own*, except by special invitation and upon certain divinely fixed conditions, viz :

2. *Each Jew, each family, must possess the self same qualifications that the family possessed which invited.*

If they lacked any one of them they could not by God's law be invited. If a Jew was uncircumcised he could not eat the Passover with his own or any other family without willfully sinning against God. Now all Pedobaptists known to me, and all Methodists, except my opponent, hold and teach that Christian Baptism comes in the room and place of circumcision—this argument is conclusive to them, that no unbaptized person can partake of the Lord's Supper, but I will not press it upon Elder Ditzler because he has surrendered it—that baptism, comes in the room of circumcision—as he now says the Lord's Supper does in place of the Passover—but I do press it as conclusive upon all Methodists who endorse their Discipline and the standard theological exponents of Methodism like R. Watson, Wesley, Dr. Summers and Bishop McTyeire—and I will press his own position upon him. He affirmed that Proselyte Baptism was continuously practiced by the Jews, and that Christian Baptism comes in place of *it*—and is governed by the same laws. If so, then as no one or no Gentile in particular, could partake of the Passover, unless he had received this baptism, therefore *now* no Gentile can partake of the Lord's Supper without Christian Baptism. He must feel the force of this if he is susceptible of feeling.

3. *But the master of the family was not at liberty to invite whomsoever he pleased—or whensoever he felt like it.*

He had no right to any personal feeling about it, he must obey the law of God at his own peril. (1). He could only invite when his own family could not eat all the Lamb. (2). The family invited must not only possess the same qualifications of the family inviting, but it must not bring in any *leaven*.

Now apply this to the Supper. Each local church is a family, independent of all others, and the Supper is placed under its guardianship and *it* is responsible for its purity. The Supper does not belong to the church. It has no right to make rules governing it. It has no right to invite whom it pleases.

It is the Lord's Supper, and the church must observe the Lord's rules. It must not invite another family though bearing the name of Baptists or any name, unless possessing the *same qualifications with itself*. The family invited must bring in

no *leaven*. No unscriptural doctrine, no divisions—no confessedly unregenerate member, no malice, no bitterness, no heresies, no members walking disorderly in the judgment of the inviting church and refuse to be baptized. This is the law of Christ. To refuse to be baptized at all as Christ commanded, and thus set at naught his authority, would be to walk disorderly—it would be open disobedience and rebellion.

But he says that my position is setting up men—the church in judgment upon men's religious profession.

All I can or care to say is, the Lord Jesus has placed this responsible duty upon his church and she must discharge it, no matter what men may say. The command to her is, purge out the old leaven. It is her business to judge those, and only those *under her disciplinary control*, not those without her jurisdiction. Let me read again—

“I wrote unto you in an epistle not to company with fornicators.” “Yet not altogether with the fornicators of the world, or with the covetous, or extortioners, or with idolaters; for then must ye needs go out of the world.” “But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such a one no not to eat.” “For what have I to do to judge them that are without?” “But them that are without God judgeth.”

These Scriptures are thoroughly conclusive that the unbaptized in the estimation of the church—for all such are confessedly *without*—cannot be invited to the Lord's Supper. The indiscriminate invitations now so common, to all members of sister churches who may be present to come forward and participate, is unscriptural and of evil tendency. The church does not know whether those who come forward are baptized or not—does not know whether they are bringing a mass of leaven with them or not—or whether they are “sound in the faith and orderly in their Christian walk.” They may be heterodox—they may be “revelers” and “drunkards”—“impostors.” What is the church to do? If she does not know that each one is without leaven—she has no authority to invite. A professed minister may be present, but unless the church has good evidence that he is all right, she has no right to invite him to preach or assist in administering the Supper.

Let each church limit her Supper as she does her voting—

to her own members and then no one will have any cause to complain, and this continual cry of close communion would be silenced in one day. If a brother member or minister should be present at a communion season, and any one member well acquainted with him, should vouch for his fitness in all respects, or a minister so well known to all as to need no letter "of commendation," the church would be justified in inviting him, for she always has more than her own family can eat, but in every case let it be done upon a motion, and the unanimous vote of all.

Christ said the children of the world are wiser in their generation than the children of light; Do not Masonic and Odd-Fellow Lodges act upon these very principles? Can any one because he professes to be a Mason enter the Lodge, or professing to be a Master Mason in a Lodge five hundred or a thousand miles away, is he therefore invited to officiate without examination? And who ever heard a Mason complain because he is ever so strictly examined and his pretensions tested? The officers of a Masonic Lodge very well know that it is their duty to *know* that each one entering to participate in its privileges is all right, and can it be less the duty of the Church of Christ and its officers, who are so expressly commanded to let no leaven pollute the feast, no unqualified person to partake of it. And who in all the world ever heard an Odd Fellow complain of and abuse Masons, because they were not allowed to enter and enjoy the rites and ordinances of Masonry. No one, and what shadow of reason have Methodists, Presbyterians and Disciples to complain of Baptists because they do not invite them to the ordinances of our churches? Why not complain, and call us "close," illiberal, and narrow and unchristian, because we don't invite them to come and *vote* in the election of a pastor or in the discipline of a member? They have as much reason in the one case as in the other.

Eld. Ditzler, to excite your prejudices, says we do not invite Pedobaptists because we regard them as reprobates! Every candid man knows it is because we do not believe they are Scripturally baptized, and all those, more Christian than partisan among them, admit that we are consistent in this

FINALLY, This law was strictly observed by all the Apostolic Churches, and by all professed Christendom, until the rise of Methodism, as all commentators and historians are free to declare. To Methodists alone belong the absurdity of administering The Supper to the confessedly unbaptized, and at the door of Methodism alone is laid the fearful sin of administering it to the unbaptized sinner to convey to his soul the grace of justification, and to renew his soul in the image of God. Why does Eld. Ditzler stand here and advocate that the Supper should be carried out of the Church, and given to the unbaptized and unregenerate?

For no other reason than to use it as a *sacrament* of salvation—a means of salvation, the channel of salvation! This is as gross a perversion of it as that of which the Catholics are guilty when they make it a “bloodless sacrifice of Christ.” It is for this Dr. Ditzler administers it to sinners. He has vowed to hold and teach that Baptism is a sacrament “by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only *quicken*, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him.”

In 1840, the Methodist Episcopal Church, issued from their office, No. 200 Mulberry street, New York, a book entitled “Wesleyana,” or a complete system of Wesleyan Theology. Of course it is endorsed by all the Methodists of our country. No one will dispute this.

Chapter xvi. sec. 1, is devoted to the subject of “Means of Grace” Hear this, “The Lord’s Supper was ordained by God to be a means of conveying to men either preventing, or *justifying*, or sanctifying grace, according to their several necessities. The persons for whom it was ordained are all those who know and feel that they want the grace of God, either to restrain them from sin, or to show their sins forgiven or to *renew their souls in the image of God*. To come to the Supper of the Lord, no fitness is required at the time of communicating, but a sense of our state of utter sinfulness and helplessness; every one who knows he is *fit for hell being just fit to come to Christ in this as well as all other ways of his appointment*.”—pp. 283, 284.

And, on page 258 second paragraph, we have these words: “This (the supper) is also an ordinary, stated means of *receiving*—

ing the grace of God." * * "Is not the eating of that bread and the drinking of that cup, the outward, visible means whereby God *conveys into our souls* that *spiritual grace*, that righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost, which were purchased by the body of Christ once broken, and the blood of Christ once shed for us?"

A strong writer, commenting on this, has said : "Is not this "worshipping the creature above one that is called God?" Is not this the same in substance as the worship it receives at the hands of the Mother of Harlots and abominations of the earth? Both Catholics and Methodists aim at the same end, the pardon of sin. Both believe the rite to be efficacious—both believe that sanctity of heart and life are attained through the *observance of this ceremony*." That "the complete system of Wesleyan Theology" holds this ceremony as a *converting* instrument in the hands of the clergy is evident from its own language on page 284. "In latter times many have affirmed that the Lord's Supper is not a *converting ordinance*." * * * The falsehood of this objection, appears both from Scripture precept and example."

We can see from this why Methodist Presiding Elders, invite and urge sinners all over this land to come and partake of their Supper and tell them that if they were ever converted, it was when as guilty sinners they were partaking of it. Fearful, pernicious teaching!! Is it any wonder that intelligent Baptists cannot commune with Methodists?

It is true as charged that Wesleyan Methodists one and all, are holding this figment of popery, which though it does not teach the transubstantiation of the *accidents of bread and wine* into the real body of Christ, it holds that it transubstantiates the *sinner* into a saint. So much are they wedded to sense, that what God has reserved as His own prerogative, a little piece of bread and sip of wine, when consecrated by the prayers of a Presiding Elder, are so magnified as to usurp the power to "*convert the soul*," which embraces the whole process of regeneration and sanctification. I would as soon partake of the idolatrous mass of the Catholics! How can Presbyterians, how can Disciples eat the supper with Methodists?

Do they believe this? I will not say it. How can Methodists oppose the Baptism of the Disciples, for the remission of sins, when they themselves practically claim for their own "sacraments" a power of conveying salvation to the souls of the most sinful?

DR. DITZLER'S THIRD REPLY

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—Let us not forget the issue before us. It is not only whether a regenerate soul and a baptized regenerate believer—one of God's children, has a right to his Lord and Master's table through Christ or not, but whether it is suspended 1. upon impossible conditions, 2. Absurd conditions, 3. Monstrous and intolerent conditions.

From Dr. Graves' stand-point we have shown that no one, no Baptist, no person on earth can take the Lord's Supper. We quoted the Doctor, *The Texas Baptist Pulpit*, etc., and Ford, J. L. Waller of Kentucky, Orchard, and all agree here, that to be a baptized person the following conditions must hold good in every case. 1. The party baptized must be dipped, "immersed." 2. He must be regenerated before he is dipped, else it is not baptism, any more than if you dipped a rock or a cat. 3. The party must be baptized for the right purpose. 4. He must be baptized with the proper symbolism. 5. It must be by the proper administrator, by one who represents such a state of things in every link in the chain, in every person baptized who is a link in the chain of the tens of thousands between him and the apostolic age! If the man who baptized you has not all five of these things holding good in his case, he is not a proper, not a legitimate administrator. And so of his baptizer, and his on, on till the apostolic age. What a monstrous mass of hideous absurdities!

Let us test just one of these five absurdities. He must be baptized with the right symbolism. If he does not mean to represent *all* that baptism symbolized, or the party baptizing him rather, it is not baptism! Now Baptists make baptism symbolize from five to eight or nine things—regeneration, death to sin, purity of life, sign of death, burial, resurrection, and make it *initiatory* into the church, etc., etc. Now how on earth can they presume that such were the views of every baptism that stands between them and eighteen hundred

years ago? How startling the absurdity!! It implies, as we said, 1. Infallibility of judgment in the administrator to fail of error in judging whether the man's heart was in every baptism since apostolic days in that line regenerate or not. 2. Omniscience—to know all hearts. 3. Ubiquity or omnipresence—in all the line of baptisms down. This throws the claim of popes and councils into contempt. It overshadows all the infallibility of the Vatican, and perfectly dwarfs the claims of Pius the Ninth.

Now let us examine a little further into American Baptist history. It is a fact that a party of men, some twelve in number, went to Rhode Island, settled on a spot they called Providence. Not one of them had been baptized by immersion. They had all been sprinkled. Now Benedict, Backus, Cramp, all standard Baptist historians, tell us that Holliman baptized Williams, then Williams baptized the eleven, and they constituted the first Baptist church in America. Thos. Olney is one of their party, and Wm. Wickenden soon became another. Backus, 1, 102, Benedict 450. These two became leading Baptist ministers. Another celebrated Baptist minister is Wm. Vaughn, who organized the second church at Newport, and became a pastor to it, Benedict, 467. But he was baptized by Wickenden, whose baptism was from Williams.

Now in view of these facts, all from the highest Baptist standards in America, all confirmed by all the standard historians of our country, what becomes of this myth about succession? Does Dr. Graves complain of my charges as to the reliability of their writers on history when treating on the dogmas and practices that separate us and them? Why, who throws more discredit on their standard and best historians, than he, Ford and their kind. They do not allow that the very men who were selected to write *Baptist* history because of their advantages, opportunities and contiguity to the churches and records, are at all trustworthy on the very things of all else they were best qualified to write on, and where they had no motive to suppress or depart from the truth.

But these Baptist standards all put it in evidence that bap-

tism was a deplorable failure till it was rescued and saved by Methodism. Drs. Jeter, Cramp, Backus, Benedict, all prove that. Backus proves 1,152, that up to 1741—after one hundred years' existence and over, there were only nine Baptist churches in Massachusetts, "and none in New Hampshire and Vermont"—no, nor in Georgia, North Carolina, New York, or Maryland. The first in Vermont was in 1768, the second in 1773.

Here then we see their succession theories utterly ground to powder in the house of its own ablest historians. We mean what we say when we assert that all the ablest Baptist historians—all the learned Baptists of New England and New York do utterly repudiate this myth, as well as those of Virginia and Pennsylvania. It is a whim of the imagination, a film of the blinded eyes of prejudice, a dream of intolerance, born of bigotry, and palmed off upon the unwary and uninformed.

The Doctor thinks Judas did not take the supper. Mark thus relates it, ch. xiv, 13-20, "And as they sat and did eat, Jesus said, Verily I say unto you, one of you which eateth with me shall betray me. And he answered, it is one of the twelve that dippeth with me in the dish, and as they (the twelve) did eat, Jesus took bread and blessed and brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them; and they all drank of it."—23d verse. So Luke xxvii, 17-21. So it is certain Judas partook of it. Christ left him to his own responsibility in the premises.

But we demand to know if you have any right to set this ordinance above others, or this particular command above other commands of Jesus Christ. He commands all our duties. He commands honesty, charity, purity, prayer, duty as parents, as children, neighbors. Are any of these less important than the Supper—purely a memorial outward, though solemn and beautiful service? Is it more imperative than paying one's debts, or bringing up our children in the nurture of the Lord? Now let me ask, do you debar people from the communion because of failure to obey these commands? Are all

Baptists kept away for want of observing these all-important commands of the Master? Alas! no. Here, then, you are attaching undue value to one command over other equally vital ones, which is wrong.

You act on the assumption that the apostles at once baptized all their converts. This is so far from correct that there is no proof that the twelve ever baptized anybody in all their lives. It is evident from the records that they did not personally baptize, and Paul only baptized a few persons, 1 Cor. i, 15-17. See Acts x, 44-47, Peter "commanded them to be baptized." Were these parties now to wait for baptism before they could take the supper? There is nothing in baptism, its nature, object or "symbolism" that necessitates it. We do hope to see this baptismal question put upon its true and Bible merits, and end this endless war on it. It has been made to be everything by turns. No wonder people are confused over it. We are told by the old dark-agists that it is a door, a seal of the covenant, a sign of regeneration, a symbol of death, burial, resurrection, an initiatory rite, entrance into the church, a pledge of pardon, remission of sins—yea, a God indeed, they had as well say. We have a supreme disgust for the silly trash that old sleepers have spun out on this ordinance, and repeated in all the land by the Rip Van Winkles of theology.

The Doctor thinks I am out of order by going into an exposure of his absurdities. He gives us his position. We examine it, test his position, and how can it be out of order? But the Doctor has forgotten how he quoted creeds, confessions and prayer-books—rituals, tracts, theological text-books from Presbyterians, Episcopalians and Methodists when on Infant Baptism. What had *they* to do with the scripturalness of Infant Baptism? Nothing at all. But his position on what constitutes valid baptism, is right to the point here. Yet he pretends that to show what Baptists mean by baptism is out of order!

Now it is well known that they pretend it is not close communion, but close baptism—we demand immersion. Our consciences are very tender here, and you must bear that in

mind. But "Disciples" are immersed. Ah! you are not immersed for the right purpose, etc., nor by a constituted authority! Ah, yes! Well there is a good man who was immersed by a regular Baptist preacher, but he has united with the Methodists now, and yet presents his claim for the emblems. Do you give *him* the Supper? No, no! Why? Is he not one you immersed? Yes. Is he not a pious, excellent man? Yes. *Why* do you refuse him the emblems? That tells the story. It is not close baptism, but CLOSE BIGOTRY!!

What if Wall did write to prove immersion in every age—he could not do it till the close of the second century and dawn of the third, when it was a superstitious, trine immersion. He proved aspersion in the Apostolic age—that is better. As to authorities, none of them take Dr. Graves' view. They all reject his theory. By his position, not one of all the authorities he quotes is correct.

We call your attention to the fact that the *founders* of the Baptist church wholly rejected such a position as the Doctor holds. Smyth, Helwys, and all their leaders in England—Williams, Clark, Olney, Backus, all held differently. It is a little remarkable, also, that the three greatest lights the Baptists ever have produced—Bunyan, Hall, Spurgeon—were all open communionists, and Spurgeon has said the severest, the most cutting things against it that ever was said by any one, I reckon. It makes the Christian system far more illiberal than the Jewish church in its most ritualistic times. This we elaborated before.

They have relied much on the words of the commission—"baptize, teaching them to observe *all* things." That is right; but what has it to do with what a regenerate soul may do before baptism? Teach them *to observe* all things surely does not mean that the party could not do duty and observe a command of Jesus before the minister chose to baptize him.

The very fact that the Twelve observed it before baptism was instituted as an established rite of the church or commanded, or named, and the absence of any proof that they had been baptized at all, themselves, settles that point. But

it is not simply baptism they interpose, but *the five elements* that must enter into baptism to make it baptism at all—there is the ten-fold evil the Doctor has to grapple with, but utterly ignores.

Dr. Graves winces under our rebuke for so quoting and applying scripture, as to make Presbyterians, Disciples and Methodists wicked reprobates.

DR. GRAVES—I deny such intention. I had no such intention whatever.

DR. DITZLER—No, I have no idea he meant it that way—none whatever. But they have gotten into such a habit of looking wholly one sided at this question, that they do not notice the weakness and very offensive nature of their applications of Scripture. The Baptist Pulpit in my hand does the same thing—quoting those Scriptures that advise us to keep aloof from the basest of characters to show *why* they won't hold communion with other churches.

He claims great things for Baptists on Liberty, and tells of the commission of Holland and what they reported, and this is paraded as *Baptist* glory. Now, 1. It was not Baptists at all, but Anabaptists they tell us of. No Baptist existed earlier than 1606 to 1608 on this earth, as we have shown from their own record.

2. By Anabaptists they do not mean those of the kind existing in Germany, whom all Europe detested.

3. They simply mean those various sects who repeatedly broke off from Rome and rebaptized, not on account of mode, nor infant baptism, since *all* of them baptized infants, save such as repudiated baptism altogether—the Manichæans, etc.

4. In the next place Benedict puts it in evidence that *but* for the restraining power of the civil Magistrates, the Baptists—the *first* Baptists would have virtually exterminated each other in Holland and England. And hardly were they settled in America than they began war on each other over questions of psalmody, elders, etc.

5. Finally it was in Holland where the noble Arminius, Kepler and others had taught liberty that mainly Williams,

Locke and others caught all the ideas they had on toleration and liberty. In blood and sufferings Holland had worked out that question before there was a Baptist on earth. Baptists never had the upper hand or power to persecute in any land, and hence are yet to be tried. The Anabaptists showed *their* hand the moment they got power, even though only for a day. And the readiness with which they vilify, asperse and traduce those who differ from them, shows their capacity if they had the power.

They poured abuse on Bunyan in torrents because an open communionist. He was denounced as "Anti-Christ," "liar," "devil," etc., by his own brethren. These tempers tell too plainly what they would do had they the power.

But Dr. Graves tried to make a point by the fact that no one but *a member of the family* could take the Paschal Feast. Grant it, what help does it afford to his cause? It is on my side—supports our position. THE CHURCH AS A WHOLE IS GOD'S FAMILY. "The whole family in heaven and earth" is of Him, and "one bread and one body." Eph. iii, 13, 14; 1 Cor. x, 16, 17; Tim. iii, 15. All who have the Spirit of Christ are "adopted" into his family, household, church. Rom. viii, 14-17; Eph. ii, 19-22; 1 Cor. xii, 13, etc. Hence all his adopted, regenerated children are entitled to the Supper. Hence while this fact gives no support to your cause, and a congregation, as such, is not equivalent to a family, nor so put in the New Testament, yet our position is supported by it—his church is his family. Hence all his church spiritual that can do this in remembrance of Him, is entitled to the ordinance.—[*Time out.*

DR. GRAVES' FOURTH SPEECH.

MR. PRESIDENT:—I came here to discuss the question you announced,—to affirm and to prove by God's Word, and the concurrent voice of the Christian world, and the practice of the church of God in all ages—that "Christian baptism is prerequisite to the Lord's Supper." Nor can I be turned again, for one moment, aside to notice his persistent misstatement of the *faith* and perversion and travesty of the history of Baptists, until I have put in all my arguments and proofs, and then if time should permit, I will employ it in exposing his unwarranted statements which he designedly introduces here, to excite the prejudice of his partizans and the uninformed and unthinking, against me and my people.

I now add to my Scripture arguments and proof, the testimony of the highest authorities of the Methodist Church first: and then, that of the representative writers of all denominations.

1st. What are the teachings of the M. E. Church Standards?

1. METHODIST DISCIPLINE, Art. xiii. "The visible church of Christ *in which* the Sacraments [baptism and the Lord's Supper] are duly administered." That none can, according to its Ritual, "be admitted to its communion" without baptism. See Dis. Chap. 13, Sec. 4.

2. DR. ADAM CLARK (Methodist), in his "Discourse on the Eucharist," remarks: "As no person could partake of the Paschal lamb before he was *circumcised* (Exod. xiii. 43-48), so, among the early followers of God, no person was permitted to come to the Eucharist till he had been *baptized*." (See Eucharist, p. 46.)

3. RICHARD WATSON says: "It is obligatory on all who are convinced of the truth of Christianity to be baptized; and *upon those thus baptized*, frequently to partake of the Lord's Supper."

He clearly places baptism before the Supper.

Dr. G. F. Hibbard, in his work on Baptism, (which, in 1852, was made, by the General Conference, the text book for all theological students, and is I think to-day,) says:

"It is certain that baptism is enjoined as the *first public duty* after discipleship. The *very positio*, therefore, that baptism is made to

occupy in relation to a course of Christian duty, namely, *at the commencement*, sufficiently establishes the conclusion that *the ordinance of the Supper*, and all other observances which have an exclusive reference to the Christian profession, must come in as *subsequent duties*. And thus we hold that Christ enjoined the *order*, as well as the duties themselves; and in this order of Christ, baptism *precedes* communion at the Lord's table." (Hibbard on Baptism, part 2, p. 177.)

"It will be more satisfactory to inquire, *How* the Apostles understood the commission with respect to the *relative order* of the Christian institutes? The argument from *apostolic precedent* is undeniably important. They were commissioned to *teach* the converted nations 'to observe *all things whatsoever*' Christ had *commanded*. This was the extent, and this the limit of their authority. What, then, did the Apostles teach and practice with respect to the *time* and *relative order* of baptism? On the day of Pentecost, when the people inquired of the Apostles: 'Men and brethren, what shall we do? Peter answered, *Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ*,' etc. (Acts ii. 38.) Luke sums up the glorious *results* of that memorable day thus: 'Then they that *gladly received* his word were *baptized*; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. And they continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and *in breaking of bread*, and in prayers.' (Acts ii. 41, 42.) This was the first occasion on which the Apostles had been called upon to exercise their high commission. And here, indeed, we are called upon to notice particularly the *order* in which they enforced the divine precepts. Upon their anxious hearers they enjoined, *first*, repentance; *then* baptism; *then* the duty of church membership; and *then* 'breaking of bread,' or the Lord's Supper. Comparing the *order* here observed with the *order* of the words of the commission, we are struck with admiration at the prompt fidelity of the Apostles." (Hibbard on Baptism, part 2, pp. 176-179.)

Again: For example, DR. HIBBARD (Methodist) says: "The concurrent voice of the Christian world excludes an unbaptized person from fellowship in the visible Church of God." * *

"It is but just to remark, that in *one principle* the Baptist and Pedobaptist churches agree. They both agree in *rejecting* from communion at the table of the Lord, and in *denying* the rights of church fellowship to *all who have not been baptized*. Valid baptism they (the Baptists) consider as *essential* to constitute visible church membership. *This we* (Pedobaptists) *also hold*. The only question, then, that here divides us is: 'WHAT IS ESSENTIAL TO VALID BAPTISM?'" (Hibbard on Bap., part 2, p. 174.)

"Baptism, from its very nature, stands at the *opening* of the visible career. It is a *badge* of the Christian profession—the seal of the Gospel covenant—the *ordinance of admission into the visible Church of Christ*. Previously to baptism, the individual has no rights in the visible Church. No society of Christians would receive an *unbaptized* person into their community, and tender to him the privileges of their body. So far as proper church rights and privileges are concerned, he is regarded in the same light as any unconverted man.

Speaking of Dr. Kendrick's argument for baptism preceding the Supper the Western Christian Advocate (Meth.) of January 11, 1871, says "Nor do we doubt that the *legitimate order* of the sacraments [baptism is as our contemporary contends. Baptism very properly comes before the Lord's Supper."

You see that Elder Ditzler stands here to "inveigh" against the teachings of the Discipline and the highest recognized standards of his own church, and I call upon his Conference to impeach him—or revise or expurgate its standards.

Let us now hear the testimony of the representative writers of other denominations.

"LORD CHANCELLOR KING, a distinguished Episcopalian, in his *"Inquiry,"* part 2, p. 44, says, "Baptism was *always precedent* to the Lord's Supper; and none were ever admitted to receive the eucharist till they were *baptized*. This is so obvious to every man that it needs no proof."

Says Vincent L. Milner: "In requiring baptism and church fellowship among these qualifications, they [Baptists] agree with almost all Christians in every age and country. If their views of baptism are correct they are bound to apply them imperatively to all who apply for admission to communion." Speaking of baptism as a non-prerequisite to the Supper the *Churchman* says: "We need not say to churchmen that this is a view which is utterly repugnant to the whole teaching of the church in every age, and to the whole course of history." Says Dr. Manton: "None but baptized persons have a right to the Lord's Supper."—*Supplement to Morning Exercises*, p. 199.)

PROF. GARDNER says: "So all denominations believe and teach at the present day. Hence it is that no church of any denomination, except [the Methodists] a few Free Communion Baptists, will admit any person, however pious, to its communion table, *unless* he has been *baptized* in some way. This is the great reason why the advocates of "open communion" withhold the elements from their *own candidates* for baptism, and from the *pious Quakers*, who deny all water baptism." (Gardner on Com. p. 50.)

ROBERT HALL, the celebrated leader of Free Communion Baptists in England, says: "Let it be admitted," as it unquestionably is by all other mixed communionists, "that baptism is, under all circumstances, a *necessary* condition of church fellowship, and it is IMPOSSIBLE for the Baptists to act otherwise;" *i. e.*, than to *restrict* their communion at the Lord's Table to their *own churches*. "The recollection of this may suffice to rebut the *ridicule* and silence the *clamor* of those who so loudly condemn the Baptists for a proceeding which, were they (Mixed Communionists) but to change their opinion on the subject of baptism, their *own principles* would compel them to adopt. They both concur in a *common principle* (namely, that baptism is *prerequisite* to the Lord's Supper), from which the practice (of *restricted* communion), deemed so offensive, is the *necessary* result." (Hall's Works, vol. 2, p. 213.)

Here is the testimony of the Presbyterians—

"DR. EDWARD D. GRIFFIN (Presbyterian), late President of Williams College, in his celebrated 'LETTER on Communion at the Lord's Table, addressed to a member of a Baptist Church,' in 1829, remarks: 'That we ought not to commune with those who are not baptized, and of course are not church members, even if we regard them as Christians.'" See Fuller on Communion, p. 270.)

DR. JOHN DICK (Presbyterian), in maintaining that "baptism is *requisite* to entitle a person to a seat at the table of the Lord," says: "I do not know that this was ever called in question till *lately*, that a controversy has arisen among the English Baptists, whether persons of other Christian denominations may not be *occasionally* admitted to the holy communion with them; and it became necessary for those who adopted the affirmative to maintain that baptism is *not* a previous condition. This assertion arose out of their peculiar system, which denies the *validity* of infant baptism. But to every man who contents himself with a plain view of the subject, and has no purpose to serve by subtleties and refinements, it will appear that baptism is as much the *initiating ordinance* of the Christian as circumcision was of the Jewish dispensation. An *uncircumcised* man was not permitted to eat the Passover, and an *unbaptized* man should not be permitted to partake of the Eucharist." (Dick's Theology, Lect. 92, p. 494.)

The American Presbyterian, a standard church paper:

Open communion is an absurdity when it means communion with the unbaptized. I would not for a moment consider a proposition to admit an unbaptized person to the communion; and can I ask a Baptist so to stultify himself, and ignore his own doctrine, as to invite me to commune with him while he believes I am unbaptized? I want no sham union and no sham unity, and if I held the Baptist notion about immersion I would no more receive a Presbyterian to the communion than I now would receive a Quaker. Let us have unity, indeed, but not at the expense of principle, and let us not ask the Baptist to ignore or to be inconsistent with his own doctrine. Let us not either make an outcry at his close communion, which is but faithfulness to principle, until we are prepared to be open communionists ourselves, from which stupidity may we be forever preserved.

The *Interior*, a representative Presbyterian paper of high merit, says:

"We agree with them (Baptists) in saying that unbaptized persons should not partake of the Lord's Supper." Again, "Close communion, in our judgment, is a more defensible position than open communion, which is justified on the ground that baptism is not prerequisite to partaking of the Lord's Supper."

Dr. Doddridge, a learned and pious Independent Pedobaptist, remarks:

"It is certain that as far as our knowledge of primitive antiquity

extends, no *unbaptized* person ever received the Lord's Supper. How excellent soever any man's character is, he must be *baptized* before he can be looked upon as completely a member of the Church of Christ." (Dodridge's Miscellaneous Works, p. 510.)

Here is what Congregationalists testify

DR. TIMOTHY DWIGHT (Congregationalist), late president of "Yale College," affirms: "It is an *indispensable* qualification for this ordinance that the candidate for communion be a member of the visible Church of Christ *in full standing*. By this I intend that he should be a person of *piety*; that he should have made a *public profession* of religion; and that he should have been *baptized*." (Dwight's Theology, vol. 4, p. 365.)

"And DR. NATHANIEL EMMONS (Congregationalist) observes: As to the Gospel Church, it is plain that it was composed of none but *visible saints*. No other but *baptized persons* were admitted to communion; and no adult persons but such as professed *repentance and faith*, were admitted to baptism, which shows that they were visible saints." (See Platform, page 2.)

I quote from the *Independent*, under a previous editorial management, when it was a recognized mouthpiece of Congregationalism. Speaking of the Baptist principle of restricted communion, the following were its words:

"We do not see how their principle differs from that commonly admitted and established in Presbyterian and Congregational churches."

Here is the teaching of A. Campbell, the founder of the sect known as Campbellites or Disciples, and of their standard papers:

Alex. Campbell: "But I object to making it a rule, *in any case*, to receive unimmersed persons to church ordinances: 1st. Because it is nowhere commanded. 2d. Because it is nowhere preceded in the New Testament. 3d. Because it necessarily corrupts the simplicity and uniformity of the whole genius of the New Testament. 4th. Because it not only deranges the order of the kingdom, but makes *void* one of the most important institutions given to man. It necessarily makes *immersion* of non-effect. 5th. Because in making a canon to dispense with a divine institution of momentary import, they who do so assume the very same *dispensing power* which issued in that tremendous apostasy which we and all Christians are laboring to destroy. If a Christian community puts into its magna charta, covenant, or constitution, an assumption to dispense with an institution of the Great King, who can tell where this power of granting license to itself may terminate?"—(*Christian Baptist*, vol. vi, answer to query 3.)

The *American Christian Review* says: "Some of the teachers we refer to are not satisfied it is wrong to commune with the unimmersed. If Pedobaptists are in the Kingdom of Christ, let us say nothing more about sprinkling, nor against any other innovation. If we invite them

to commune with us, as certain wishy-washy preachers have done, why then to be consistent let us sprinkle as others do; if we are 'sincere and conscientious,' that fills the bill, we are Christians together. Let us drop our plea and all sail in the same boat. Is any true Disciple of Christ ready for a reconciliation as humiliating as that? If so, don't stand on the order of your going, but go at once. We say all this at the risk of being called a bigot, an exclusionist, a close-communionist. There is as much authority for communing with Free Masons, and Odd Fellows, and Good Templars, as with any school of Pedobaptists if we can commune with a people who reject one of the commands of Jesus Christ, and with those who substitute tradition for the Bible; because are not all these 'sincere and conscientious?' "

The *Apostolic Times*, of February 29, 1872, says: "I do not believe that the unimmersed can set the Lord's table; at least, I do not believe they do it. Hence with me, a table set by them is not the Lord's table; and I would not eat at it. From the preceding it would appear that I am a close communionist. This I certainly am, in the severest, true sense of the term."

In the *Christian Quarterly* for January, 1875, Robert Graham, President of Hocker Female College says: "In regard to what is called open or close communion the position of the Disciples is peculiar. Pedobaptist churches are generally open or free communionists. This they can be in harmony with their principles. All churches agree that baptism is a prerequisite to communion at the table of the Lord; and as Pedobaptists accept sprinkling, and pouring, and immersion as valid forms of baptism, they can receive at the table of the Lord any one who has been baptized, and is living a Godly life. Baptists, however, do not allow anything to be baptism but the immersion of a believer; and in this the Disciples are in perfect agreement with them; hence, neither of the churches can consistently advocate open communion."

I close my proof with the statement of Dr. Wall, Episcopalian historian, one of Elder Ditzler's principal witnesses against Baptists. He will not dispute his word now:

"No church ever gave the communion to any person before they were baptized. Among all the absurdities that ever was held, none ever maintained that any person should partake of the communion before he was baptized."—Hist. Inf. Bap. Part ii, ch. ix.

Neander, Mosheim and Schaff, Luther and Historians agree in saying that in all antiquity no orthodox church was ever heard of that gave the communion except to the baptized.

I appeal then to the Christian candor of all men who hear me to say if Baptists deserve to be called bigots, illiberal, sectarian, or actuated by unchristian principles and feeling, because they hold and teach and make by their practice *baptism a prerequisite to communion?* And I appeal once more to every Ameri-

can freeman, who rejoices in the inestimable birthright of religious freedom, if Baptists have not the right to *believe*, and in the exercise of their own ecclesiastical affairs, to require all who participate in the supper with them in their churches, to be scripturally baptized, as they themselves have been? Has any living man, or body of men, or angel the right to demand that we shall throw open our churches and communion-tables to all indiscriminately, to the unbaptized sinner as well as the unbaptized saint? Would it be any thing else than the spirit of despotism, and persecution, to say to us that our conscientious convictions shall not be respected by Pedobaptists, and while they claim the right to enjoy their religious rights, and admit to their churches and tables whom they please, yet we Baptists shall not be permitted to do so? Read the following from the pen of Albert Barnes, the Presbyterian Commentator, and no longer doubt for one moment, had he but the power, he would inaugurate as severe persecutions against us as marked the darkest days of the papacy, or as breathe in the speeches that you have heard since this question was opened.

DR. BARNES says: "We *claim and demand* of the Baptists, that they shall not merely recognize the *ministry* of other denominations, but their *membership also*; that while, if they prefer it, they may continue the *practice of immersion* in baptism as a part of their Christian liberty, they *shall* concede the same liberty to others, (*i. e.*, to practice adult and infant *sprinkling or pouring* for baptism;) and while they expect that *their* acts of baptism shall be recognized by others as valid they *shall not* offer an affront to the Christian world by *re-baptizing* all who enter their communion, or by *excluding* from their *communion* all who have not been *subjected* to the rite of *immersion*. And we claim and demand of the Baptist churches that they shall recognize the members of other churches *as* members of the Church of Christ. We do not ask this as a boon, we claim it *as a right*." (See Barnes on Exclusivism, pp. 66 and 74.)

I would say to him and those who endorse such demands and such sentiments, that every true Baptist on this Continent will shed his last drop of blood, or burn at the stake, before they will recognize sprinkling or pouring for Christian baptism, or unconscious infants as scriptural subjects.—[*Time out.*

DR. DITZLER'S FOURTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—We wonder if Dr. Graves was much scared when the good and pious Barnes used the word “*shall not.*” We hope he will survive the innocent remark of Dr. Barnes which he interpreted to mean fire and sword against Baptists.

Now after all his glorification of his people, the leading sect that he, Ford, Orchard, Waller and all set down as a shining and most conspicuous link in the mystic chain—the Donatists of the third and fourth centuries, are the first denomination in Christendom that ever brought their quarrel or an ecclesiastical question before a civil tribunal—before a civil magistrate. They had appealed to the ecclesiastical tribunal—were defeated—yea, a second time, then A. D. 311 to 316, brought it before Constantine the Great, yet would not abide any of the decisions after so appealing.

The Doctor tells us that we administer baptism for regenerating the parties! Yea, as conveying, justifying—saving grace. But as neither Dr. Graves, nor any Baptist living believes it, and all of them know it is a slander and abuse, it needs no attention.

But he says we hold it to be a partaking of the body of Christ. Now let us again expose the utter weakness and astonishing blindness of such charges. Because our Discipline quotes the very language of Christ clearly used by him in a spiritual sense, and so declared by Wesley, Clarke and Watson—by all Protestant writers of note—where he tells us, John vi. 51, “except we eat his flesh and drink his blood” &c,—and Paul, 1 Cor. x. 16. “For we are all partakers of that one bread”—Christ. Now all he says against our Ritual there is still more severe against both Christ and Paul. All right-minded men know that by such language we mean just what our Ritual explains it to be in the same pages—“feed on him BY FAITH in your hearts” So the Hebrews fed on him—1

Cor. x. 3, often quoted—"did all eat the spiritual meat"—Christ. Yet now of this he makes such an ado! Does it not show a depth of prejudice and blinding influences on our opponent that utterly disqualify him to interpret his opponents fairly? Hence, from the above view these writers look on the Lord's Supper as we do on prayer, preaching, singing, as an aid or means of grace by which our zeal, love and faith are increased. Yet he objects to this! Does he not believe in the same? Of course he does.

After telling us all he did, perverting all we hold, he then says "That is the reason why sinners are invited to the communion!" If he knows anything of our laws, rules or practice, he knows that is a gross perversion, and that no such thing ever is done by us. I never heard of such a thing, nor any Presiding Elder or preacher in this house. Here are leading ministers of the M. E. Church, and M. E. Church, South—not one of them ever heard of such a thing. But our invitation is in print—we *always* read it.

"Ye that do truly and earnestly repent of yoursins and are in love and charity with your neighbors, and intend to lead a new life, following the commandments, draw near *by faith*," etc.

He then makes us say, "pardon of sin through baptism." That is the way they quote history, lexicons, etc.

But to make bad worse, he tells us that in the west "all sinners are invited to the Supper as a converting means—*transubstantiating* sinners into saints."

We would pay no attention to such vicious and wild declamation, but it affords still additional proof beyond all question. (1) of the utter recklessness of our enemies—how completely they have yielded to temptation, and abandoned all regard for facts, and rely wholly on myths, fictions and the baseless creations of their disordered imaginations.

2. It shows the truthfulness of Methodism. That they can find no fault with her doctrine, and are compelled to drag-net creation, and at last fall back wholly on the distorted births of their own brains.

It shows what they are willing to pass current as history. It proves good my charge—they are not qualified to write his-

tory. In their quotations you never know from their use what was the fact, what the merit of the author.

I have been amused at how they report me in Texas—two Baptist papers there. At several places where I preached in Texas last winter, Baptist preachers wrote to these papers in Dallas and Houston, telling what they heard me say. It was simply ridiculous, and generally as absurd as the reports these are *now* sending out about this Debate—not a thing correctly reported, or even approximating thereto. It is a disgrace to the name of Christianity—such reckless statements and perversions.

But Dr. Graves runs the track of his ancient abuse of our church, and says Presbyterians and Baptists fought the Methodists and Episcopalians in the war of 1776! 1. It is wonderful that a man will be so reckless. The Methodist church did not exist till 1785—four years after the war was over. So there is Dr. Graves' bold and reckless way of assertion in the absence of fact or testimony.

2. There were a few Methodist Episcopalians, and as they existed mainly in Virginia, Maryland, New York, South Carolina and Georgia, they were among the best friends Washington had. It was New England where the Baptists existed that blue lights were burned, and defect and disaster overtook all our armies. It was the Baptist State of Rhode Island that did more to defeat our cause than any State of America. Coke and one or two Englishmen who came over only to visit the colonies and labor for a season returned. But Asbury and the great body of her people remained—faithful to their Colony and work. Some Baptists returned to England also—and who blames them. Were we visiting a distant continent preaching, and they got up a huge seven years' war, and my family was here, I'd leave on the first vessel, and be a fool if I did not. Yet because a few Englishmen—born and bred there and wedded to all her institutions, just as Mr. Spurgeon would do to-day, returned home, Dr. Graves quotes the question under debate and discusses the war of '76! What has it to do with close communion?

Once more the Doctor brings up Masonry again. To make

Masons and enjoy their rites, you must be regularly initiated, we presume is what he means. If so, 1. What becomes of his bold deprecation of arguments from mere analogy? 2. Does he not know that were all Masonic lodges disorganized, Masonry would still exist, survive; and as soon as they dared, they would meet again, and such meeting would be as legitimate masonry as ever existed? 3. But if baptism is the condition of membership (1) in *the Church of God*—the spiritual family. (2) of membership in the congregation, or visible body, how came John's baptism if Christian as Baptists hold, not to put them into either? and how was it Christ put them into both *without* baptism? If the church was organized *without* baptism, when did it become the door of entrance? Point it out.

But the Doctor goes back on Roger Williams. Now all historic facts show that Benedict's account is correct. Thos. Olney, successor of Williams, was pastor of that Providence church as late as 1682. Backus, 1, 102. Olney had a successor—Tillinghast. See further, Benedict 469. Benedict puts Chad. Brown, between Olney and Williams. We leave that with them. Cramp says Brown succeeded Williams. One thing is certain, their baptism all comes from those parties as we showed.

As to John Clark—we ask, where did he get his authority to baptize? He never had been dipped. He went to Providence 1638. Thence he went to Newport. They organized a political government, a body politic. In 1644 they organized a church. So shows all baptist history. Whence came his baptism? Who was there to administer legal immersion from your stand-point? No one. They were all sprinkled. Evidently they got their baptism either from Williams party or after his and Smyth's plan. Alas! for baptist succession.

He comes back on Odd Fellows, Masons, etc. Here is analogy again, so fiercely denounced by him as unallowable. But let it be admitted for his sake, and what of it? Will a Masonic Lodge exclude from aid, fellowship or recognition any Mason in good standing, in any lodge? Nay if a Mason, is he not recognized the world over by all proper lodges?

And if a man is a genuine Christian—a child adopted into God's spiritual church, called *THE church* so often in the New Testament, how *dare* you exclude him? We leave that with you. He has told you of our appealing to prejudice. We have pleaded for peace. Our people plead for peace—some acting basely in the extent of their cowardice, for forty years. Still you aggressed. We pleaded the peace of society; the welfare of the church; danger of increasing infidelity by the exhibition of contention between Christians—all, all availed nothing. A new generation of us came on, and we said—gentlemen, *there is a way to arrive at peace.* We can *conquer* a peace, and now we intend to do it.

He thinks I made a mistake on the Passover in Exodus xii. He will see I did not by examining verses 14, 21, 23, and 28, where they *DID* as the Lord had commanded. So it was eaten on that night, and it was the standing day for the beginning of its celebration ever afterwards. He will find trouble to catch me in “mistakes.”

Dr. Graves thinks I would not pursue such a course if I had better arguments. The trouble is, we do not want better, and know not how better could exist. We have seen that by their rules no one is baptized—can be baptized. This reduces it to absolute absurdity—hence it is exposed as false. We show that all Baptists in founding their sects, were compelled to go by the principles we all hold as Scriptural and reasonable. Hence we are right. That is as good as I want.

He says Benedict gave up the point. We have not his words to that effect. He copied the records. He is confirmed by Backus, Randall, Cramp, all Baptist historians, and by all the Bancrofts of our nation. Hence, if he backed down, it shows how unreliable are all Baptist writers. We could requote all the authorities, but it is useless.

Dr. Graves urges that the blood came before the water—that is before baptism. Yes, and so *we* maintain that all whose guilt demands—whose hearts are to be sprinkled from *an evil conscience*, must come to the blood of sprinkling before they are baptized. He then pleads that Baptists can't help the situation of their proscriptive rules, and roll it all on the Almighty.

That is a resort of all intolerant theories of religion.

1. There are no requirements of the kind in the Bible.
2. All history has to be perverted to support it.
3. The whole reformation was checked, Christianity has been infinitely damaged, to support it.

Not only Jeter, but Benedict, Backus and Cramp, all put it in evidence that to the beginning of Methodist revivals and influences, *your church was a failure*. Backus, who lived in that age, tells us, vol. 1, p. 152-3, "when religion was revived in 1741, there were but nine Baptist churches in all the Massachusetts government, and none in New Hampshire or Vermont." "The pastor of the Baptist church in Boston was dark in doctrine, and *opposed the revival of religion* that began there in 1740, therefore, a few of the church drew off and formed another church in 1742, and ordained a pastor in 1743." Now if this preacher was thus wild and bad, he was not regenerated when baptized, if Dr. Graves' position be true, nor did he baptize with the right symbolism, nor was he a legal administrator. Yet the other churches flow from it as a mother-church. Benedict and Cramp put it in evidence that after the Baptist church had existed one hundred and one years—from 1639 to 1740, in "North America" there were only thirty-seven churches and "less than three thousand members."—Cramp, p. 527. Nay, not till about 1768 did they have churches in Vermont, New Hampshire and some other leading States.

Such are the facts given by your own standard historians. We quote not from your enemies, or parties about to desert you, or put on your doctrines false constructions. We quote your recognized standards. All those parties put it in evidence that piety had died out, and "Socinianism" and "Arianism" swallowed up a large part of your church. This would ruin—utterly destroy the symbolism of your ordinances, cut off its legality and blot out your pretended succession, aside from all the facts we adduced. Hence, it is a myth—a wild fantastic dream, a grotesque delusion. It is sinful—a crime against society, against God and the church to make so stupendous a delusion the occasion of so much strife and injury in the church

and we hold its leaders responsible to God for it. On such flimsy pretexts we are denounced as “usurpers and rebels against the government of Christ’s church. Truth requires us to view and treat them as such,” There is the liberty loving party! We are to be viewed and TREATED as usurpers and REBELS!! And such are the miserable pretexts they have to support such a cause.—[*Time out*

DR. GRAVES' FIFTH SPEECH.

MR. PRESIDENT :—I have attempted to conduct this debate on my part, according to the Rules you read in our hearing. I have, I confess, yielded to the temptation to notice and reply to matters which I knew to be wholly irrelevant to the subject in debate, because I was well aware that they were introduced and urged by my opponent here, to be elsewhere and hereafter used to the prejudice of Baptists, unless corrected by me. This is the case now; I have had no respondent the last two days upon this whole question, as all who have heard me know, and as all who read our recorded words will see. My opponent, with no ground in the Word of God to stand upon, with the practice of every scriptural and unscriptural Church in the world against him, and at the same time, all ecclesiastical history, all theologians and the teachings of his own Discipline, and the admissions of Clarke and Watson being equally adverse to his position, has wisely yielded the whole field of discussion upon this question, and has expended his time and strength upon another as kindred to it as whether or not there is a Northwest passage from the Atlantic to the Pacific through Behrings' straits. All thinking men would decide that there may be; the navigators have never yet sailed their vessels through it after vainly attempting it for hundreds of years. I say the question my professed opponent has been discussing all this time is whether there have been a continuity of Baptist communities from the days of the Apostles until now. Suppose no man has traced the line through every year, suppose no man can do it until the history of the Dark Ages is better known, until the Archives of the Vatican and the Inquisition are thrown open and thoroughly explored—what then is it—"therefore Baptism is not prerequisite to the Lord's Supper? What connection between the premise and conclusion? I will fairly state the only argument he has made in conducting his defence.

It cannot be shown that there has been a succession of Baptist churches from Christ down—there has been no succession. Baptists sprung from Munzer in Germany—from John Smyth in England, from Roger Williams in America—are unbaptized, etc., etc. Therefore, Baptism is not prerequisite to the Supper!!!

He fully realizes the fallacy of his argument—no man better, but from the start he gave up the question, and has laid out his strength in attempting to place American Baptists in a false light before the public, and to excite the prejudice of Pedobaptists and the world against them, by a travesty of their history. Having established the proposition with proofs irrefragable—by proofs, as yet, unquestioned by him, I again leave the discussion to show you what reliance can be placed upon his manipulations of historical matters, when his object is to injure Baptists.

I have marked four statements to notice, and will do so as briefly as possible :

1. The Donatists of the fourth and seventh centuries. Baptists do claim them as their Ecclesiastical ancestors. They were the Puritans, as well as the Paterines—sufferers—and martyrs of those ages in Africa. They abjured the growing corruptions of the so-called Catholic party, the bringing of the world into the church—the rising doctrine of baptismal efficacy. They were grossly slandered and cruelly persecuted by the Catholics who had affiliated with the State, and enjoyed the favor of the Emperor Constantine. These did not respect their civil rights, and sought to rob them of their property, their houses of worship, under the plea that is urged by Catholics of this age; they had no right to exist as separate churches, but should unite with them, and submit to their authority. This the Donatists refused to do, and because they did not recognize the Catholics as Scriptural churches, as having, and therefore, as being able to give valid baptism, the Donatists re-immersed all whom they were able to convert from the Catholic faith, as all sound Baptist churches do to-day. They received from the Catholics the odious name of Ana-baptists—*i. e.*, re-baptizers. Now the stern fact stands

forth, these Donatists, Anabaptists, of the fourth century, were the true churches of Christ, or their persecutors, the Arian Catholics were—else Christ had no church or kingdom visible on this earth in these centuries. Bitterly as Eld. Ditzler and his people may hate Baptists, they must choose between these confessedly corrupt and persecuting Catholics who denied the divinity of Christ—or the persecuted Donatists, who held essentially the self-same doctrines that we Baptists hold to-day. So that the Pedobaptist Fuller could say, that the English Baptists were the Donatists new dipped.

But these Donatists thrice applied to Constantine for relief and so did the tax-oppressed Baptists of Virginia, to the Assembly for relief from the persecutions and wrongs inflicted upon them by the Anglican Catholic church. So they did to Congress, until they obtained it—all they asked and all the Donatists asked—"freedom to worship God." Gibbon says of them :

"The inflexible zeal of freedom and fanaticism animated the Donatists to refuse obedience to the usurpers whose election they disputed and whose Spiritual powers they denied."

These were the Baptists of Africa, and there was a succession of them until exterminated or driven into other lands. Christianity was extinguished in Africa by Mohammodonism. So much for Eld. Ditzler's allusion to our brethren the Donatists. He and his people have the *honor* to be related to them.

2. But the Baptists originated with the Munsterites and were the Anabaptists of the sixteenth century known as the madmen of Munster.

This is but the repetition of the slander of the Lutherans and Protestants who sought to excuse themselves by laying the charge upon the innocent. It is the cry of "stop thief" raised by the guilty to escape detection.

It is a well established and notorious fact of history that the "Munsterites" were sprinklers, and not Baptists, they were Protestants. They had followed Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli out of Rome, and broke away from their influence and ran into fanaticism and excesses of all sorts. Was this the origin of the

Baptists—were these my ancestors, or those of my opponents? Mosheim the Lutheran, whose history is published by the M. E. church, says:

“The true origin of that sect which acquired the name of Anabaptists by their administering anew the rite of baptism to those who came over to their communion, and derived that of Mennonites from that famous man to whom they owe the greatest part of their *present* felicity, IS HID IN THE REMOTE DEPTHS OF ANTIQUITY, and is consequently, extremely difficult to be ascertained.”—Vol. iv. p. 427.

Have the Baptists of America and England any connection with the sprinkling Anabaptists of Germany? Merle d’Aubigne, the distinguished author of the History of the Reformation, says:

“On one point it seems necessary to guard against misapprehension. Some persons imagine that the Anabaptists of the times of the reformation and the Baptists of our day are the same. But they are as different as possible.”

To this testimony we add that of Fessenden. In his Encyclopedia, quoted with approbation by d’Aubigne, he says:

“ANABAPTISTS.—The English and Dutch Baptists do not consider the word as at all applicable to their sect.” It is but justice to observe that the Baptists of Holland, England and the United States are to be held essentially distinct from those seditious and fanatical individuals above mentioned, as they profess an equal aversion to all principles of rebellion of the one, and enthusiasm of the other.”—Pref. to Ref. p. 10.

Dr. Barnas Sears, late President of Brown University, has recently contributed an article upon the History of the German Anabaptists of the sixteenth century and has proved to the world that the Anabaptists of the sixteenth century were the veritable followers of the Zwickau prophets, and *originated* in the year 1522, were Protestants and sprinklers and not Baptists. He says:

“It should be remembered that *this* sect appeared at first not under the name of Anabaptists, but of the Zwickau Prophets, and that for several years those in Germany with whom Luther and Melancthon were concerned, cared little about baptism in any way, and did not practice differently from the church. Of Munzer, the leader of the Anabaptists, Scide-mann his latest and most critical biographer, says: “There is not a trace of evidence that he ever rebaptized any one.” Œcolampadius says that Munzer visited him in Basle, near the beginning of 1525, which was about three years after the Zwickau party was formed. Œcolampadius asked him how he administered baptism, to which he replied, “I baptize publicly, once in two or three months, all the children of the parish that are

born during this interval." Both Fussli and Schreiber say that Munzer never rebaptized any person. The first instance of rebaptism, say they, occurred near Zurich in 1524.

In 1521 and 1522, Stork, Munzer and others broached the Anabaptist doctrines in Wittenberg, Zwickau, and other places in Saxony. But, as I have said, none of them at that time went farther than to discuss the theory of infant baptism, and that was quite incidental as relating to a mere subordinate question. They did not rebaptize adults. The first rebaptism by the Anabaptists of this period did not take place in Germany, but in Switzerland; was not performed by the disciples of Luther, but by those of Zwingli; and not in the year 1521, but in 1524.

Conrad Grebel, in a secret assembly in Zurich, baptized George Blaurock in the spring of 1524. The original account runs substantially thus: "Blaurock arose in the assembly and in an ecstatic state threw himself prostrate upon the floor. When he came out of that state, he said it was the will of God [as revealed to him] that they should, without delay, be rebaptized; whereupon, he fell upon his knees and was baptized by Grebel. Then he in turn baptized the rest." This is the first definite account we have of rebaptism by this sect.—See *The Baptist*, vol. 9, p. 123.

MUNZER HIMSELF THE HEAD AND LEADER OF THE MUNSTER "ANABAPTISTS" WAS A PEDOBAPTIST.

Let this fact be remembered and used in repelling the charge of Eld. Ditzler.

I conclude with an article from the *New American Cyclopedia* "Art. Anabaptists":

"There was another class of Anabaptists, widely different from those who have been described [the Munster men]. In some instances, undoubtedly, when the former class fell back upon their purely spiritual views, the two parties coalesced. Brandt refers to an instance in which the moderate were brought into difficulty by being found in such association with the fanatical. The distinction, however, is real, and may be traced. It is a mistake to suppose that the rejection of infant baptism during the reformation, was found among the unlearned only. Melancthon, Zwingli and Ecclampadius were all troubled by the questions which arose respecting the adjustment of this rite to the personal faith required by Protestantism. Some of those who became leaders of the Anabaptists were the associates and equals of these reformers. Mantz, Grebel and Hubmeyer were men of learning, the last of great genius and eloquence. Mantz had been the friend and fellow-student of Zwingli, and was an early martyr in the cause of the Anabaptists, Zwingli himself pronouncing the sentence in the words, '*Qui iterum mergit mergatur.*' The persecution of such men and their followers in Switzerland, shocked the moderate of all parties. In expressing his views of this persecution, Erasmus pays a tribute to the character of the sufferers in these words: 'A people against whom there is very little to be said, and concerning whom we are assured there

are many who have been reformed from the worst to the best lives ; and though, perhaps, they may foolishly err in certain opinions, yet have they never stormed towns nor churches, nor entered into any combinations against the authority of the magistrate, nor driven anybody from his government or estate.' These people, so persecuted, demanded a church composed of spiritual persons, introduced into it by a voluntary baptism. They demanded likewise the separation of the church from the state, and the non-interference of the magistrate in matters of religion. Anabaptists of the same class were found in the Netherlands in large numbers. The record of their sufferings, their martyrs multiplied by thousands, furnishes a melancholy and affecting chapter in human history. William of Orange, founder of the Dutch republic, was sustained in the gloomiest hours of his struggles by their sympathy and aid, and has left his testimony to their loyalty, industry and virtue. That great prince, however importuned, steadfastly refused to persecute them. The same class were found in England during the reign of Edward VI., and Burnet declares that not books, but flames, were used in reply to their arguments. * Simon Menno, born at the close of the fifteenth, or, as some say, at the commencement of the sixteenth century, educated for the priesthood of the Roman Catholic church, and converted in the prime of manhood to the faith of the Anabaptists, became their chief leader, and the instrument of their organization into a recognized body of Protestant Christians. *Menno disavowed for himself and his brethren any connection whatever with the fanatics of Munster*, though it is not impossible that some of the more rational of the furious party were won by him to greater sobriety of views, and to peaceful lives. * * * Mennonites and Anabaptists have from his time been interchangeable terms, and the communities so called have descended to the present age. Even while he lived, however, they became separated into two great divisions, the 'Fine' and the 'Gross,' the former claiming a more strict adherence to the austerity of the older Anabaptists, and the latter relaxing into closer resemblance to Protestants generally."

3. But Baptists originated, or derived their baptism from John Smyth, who was an Episcopalian, and immersed himself, and from him sprang the English Baptist churches, says Eld. Ditzler. This perversion of the facts of history was first started by Thos. Wall for the self-same purpose that prompts my opponent to repeat it, to injure Baptists. There is no more truth in it than in the slander I have just exposed that Munzer of Germany originated the Baptist denomination. It belongs to the men, means and instrumentalities upon which Methodist controversialists, under the lead of my distinguished opponent, rely to conquer a peace from Baptists in the Southwest, as they boast they intend—close the mouths of Baptists, and make the world hate them. It is wholly

false. The Baptists of England, when it was first made, pronounced it false—and proved it to be false—Crosby, Iveny, Evans, Kiffin.

Here are the facts gathered out of these histories which I furnished to the author of "Baptist Succession," out of my library—and they can be relied upon.

"I have gathered the following facts in regard to John Smyth and his company: *First.* John Smyth was a minister of the established Church of England. *Second.* About the year 1606, Mr. Smyth led a company of exiles—Separatists or Brownists—from England to Amsterdam, in Holland. *Third.* He here united with the English church of Brownists, under the pastorate of Mr. Ainsworth. *Fourth.* A difficulty occurred in Mr. Ainsworth's church, on account of John Smyth's opposition to infant baptism, which resulted in the exclusion of Smyth and his party from said church. *Fifth.* John Smyth and his party proceeded to administer baptism, and to the formation of a church. There is no evidence that Smyth baptized himself, but it is probable that one of his company baptized him. *Sixth.* John Smyth and a part of his company soon became dissatisfied with their rash proceedings, upon which a difficulty arose between them and the majority of the church, on account of which Smyth and his party were excluded. Thus, it appears that John Smyth was excluded from this "Baptist church" of which he was the founder. Of this, Mr. Evans, the historian, says: 'It is admitted, on all hands, that, from some cause or other, the church over which Smyth and Helwys presided was divided, but the cause of division is not so manifest. Smyth, with some twenty-four persons, was excluded from the church, and there sought communion with one of the Mennonite churches in the city.'

Seventh. Mr. Smyth repudiated his own baptism and church organization as invalid, and, with his party, sought admission into one of the Mennonite churches at Amsterdam, and was received after making the following confession: "The names of the English who confess this their error, and repent of it, viz: that they undertook to baptize themselves, contrary to the order appointed by Christ, and who now desire, on this account, to be brought back to the true Church of Christ as quickly as may be suffered.

We unanimously desire that this, our wish, should be signified to the church.

NAMES OF MEN.—"Hugh Bromhead, Jarvase Neville, John Smyth, Thomas Canadyne, Edward Hankin, John Hardy, Thomas Pygott, Francis Pygott, Robert Stanley, Alexander Fleming, Alexander Hodgkins, John Grindall, Solomon Thompson, Samuel Halton, Thomas Dolphin.

NAMES OF WOMEN.—"Ann Bromhead, Jane Southworth, Mary Smyth, Joan Halton, Alis Arnfield, Isabel Thomson, Margaret Stanley, Mary Grindall, Mother Pygott, Alis Pygott, Margaret Pygott, Betteris Dickinson, Mary Dickinson, Ellyn Paynter, Alis Parsons, Joane Briggs, Jane Argan."

The above confession may also be found in *Látin*, on page 244 of Evans' *Early Eng. Bap. His.*, Vol. I.

Eighth. After Mr. Smith and his party were "cast out" from his own church, and confessed their error in setting up for themselves, on their humble petition, they were received into a Mennonite church, whose "mode of baptism was by sprinkling or affusion."

Ninth. Not long after this, 1610, John Smyth died in Holland. He never returned to England. He never belonged to any English Baptist church; neither did he ever belong to a legitimate Baptist church at all.

Tenth. The remnant of the John Smyth church left in Amsterdam, united with the Mennonite church in 1615, and thus became extinct."

4. But the English Baptists received their baptism from the Episcopalians, if they did not from John Smyth—commenced with sprinkling, say our enemies. Not a shadow of truth in this charge. I will quote a few facts, from the same work, since he gives the authorities that sustain them.

Mr. Crosby, the historian, says: "In the time of King *Edward* the Second, about the year 1315, *Walter Lollard* a *German* preacher, a man of great renown among the *Waldenses*, came into England; he spread their doctrines very much in these parts, so that afterward they went by the name of *Lollards*."

That these Lollards were Baptists, who had their descent through the German Baptists, from the ancient Waldenses, is shown by Mr. Orchard. "The Lollards' Tower." in which these witnesses for Christ suffered, still stands in London, as a monument of Papal cruelty toward these ancient English Baptists. Of the Baptists of England, Bishop *Burnet* says: "At this time (Anno 1549) there were many *Anabaptists* in several parts of *England*. They were generally *Germans*, whom the revolutions there had forced to change their seats." In this we have the testimony of *Burnet*, that the early English Baptists, called *Anabaptists*, were from Germany, and were numerous, long before the John Smyth affair, in Holland. In the year 1538; King Henry VIII, issued a proclamation against the *Anabaptists* (Baptists) and others; and in the same year, Archbishop *Cranmer* received a commission "to inquire after *Anabaptists*, to proceed against them, to restore the penitent, to burn their books, and to deliver the obstinate to the secular arm." And of this time, "Mr. Fuller tells us, "that in this year, a match being made by the Lord Cromwell's contrivance, between King *Henry*, and the Lady *Anne*, of *Cleves*, *Dutchmen* flocked faster than formerly into *England*, and soon after began to broach their strange opinions, being branded with the general name of *Anabaptists*. 'These *Anabaptists*,' he adds, for the main, are but *Donatists*, new dipt; in this year their name first appeared in our *English Chronicles*.' 'I read,' says he 'that four *Anabaptists*, three men and one woman, all *Dutch*, bare faggots at *Paul's* cross; and three days after, a man and a woman of their *sect*, were burnt in *Smithfield*.' "

This is the testimony of Thomas Fuller, a historian of the Church of

England, that Dutch Baptists (Anabaptists) flocked into England in the year 1538, in the reign of Henry VIII., long before the time of John Smyth.

But we have still more direct testimony concerning the succession of the more modern English Baptists, from whom the Baptists of America descended. In the year 1633 a large number of Pedobaptists, belonging to the Independents, became convinced of the correctness of Baptist principles. They were puzzled at first as to the best method of obtaining valid baptism. They appointed one of their number, Richard Blunt, to visit Holland and there receive baptism from a church which was known to be in the regular succession from the ancient Waldenses."

Mr. Spilsbury was the next minister of this church and it was of this church that Eld. John Clark was a member, who organized the first Baptist church that was ever set up on this continent, A. D, 1638.

5. But the baptism of American Baptist churches originated with Roger Williams, who was an Episcopalian like John Smyth and baptized himself, says Eld. Ditzler, therefore, baptism is not prerequisite to the Supper! Now, this, the last charge I shall notice, is as unfounded as the others. It is a fact, notoriously true, that Roger Williams never was a Baptist for one day or one hour in his life, nor did he ever take the Lord's Supper with any Baptist church in his life. There is not a minister or member of any church on earth whose baptism is derived from Roger Williams.

Any one interested enough to examine the facts in the case can do so by procuring two little works from the SOUTHERN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY. Adlam's "First Baptist Church in America," and "Trilemma."

Now you should understand the real secret of my opponent's assailment of the succession of Baptist churches which we can trace direct from the Welsh Baptist churches that were planted there in the days of Paul. He knows that his church has no succession except through the church of England, thence directly into the bosom of the Papacy—the meretricious woman of Revelation. It is nothing but pure envy that prompts him to deny to Baptists what he is shamefully conscious that his sect does not possess.

6. But I have charged his church with holding and teaching doctrines which I know she does not hold or teach as baptis-

mal and sacramental efficacy. Why, then, does it stand in your Articles of Faith? Why does it stand out upon every page and paragraph of your Ritual? Why does Wesley, the author and finisher of your faith, say that "it is allowed that the whole office for baptism in our church proceeds upon the supposition that all who are baptized in infancy are at the same time born again?" Why did he say, and why did the General Conference publish it to the world, "If infants are guilty of original sin, then they are proper subjects of baptism, seeing in the ordinary way they cannot be saved unless they be washed away by baptism," thus consigning my dead infants to eternal perdition? Why do your standard writers, and even bishops declare that baptism and the Supper are "sacraments" and means of grace and salvation to the unregenerate, unless you believe it?

7. But he says that it is not true that Methodist Presiding Elders invite the unbaptized and confessedly unregenerate to come to the table they spread and call them to the Lord's Supper, as a means of grace—and converting grace. I affirm that such invitations are common all over the Southwest, and I don't believe that there is a presiding elder who hears, or may read this Debate, but has given a general invitation to all as a means of grace. Since I have declared and Elder Ditzler denied it, Elder W. A. Jarrell, before me, pastor of the church in Stonington, Illinois, puts this in writing over his name:

"In Charleston, Ill., where I was once pastor, the M. E. pastor—Mr. Wilkins—gave the bread and wine to the Sunday school children. Some of them on returning home, asked their parents "what it was done for?" In the vicinity where I am now settled, they recently invited the unconverted to take the bread and wine."

But this matter of doctrine and other things he has brought in will come up fully to-morrow and the days following. I must now close this question, giving you of my arguments, a brief

Summary.

I claim that I have demonstratively proved my proposition by the following arguments:

1. The Lord's Supper is a rite of, and in, a Christian Church.

All denominations in their articles, of faith admit this. That is not a Scriptural Church that observes it outside. It has speciously been objected that it cannot be in the church, because it is administered to initiate those without. Is not the initiating rite of Masonry *in* their Lodges—as as much so as the degrees themselves?

2. No Apostolic Church gave membership except by Christian baptism upon a profession of regeneration of heart. Proved by Scripture, and admitted by all denominations.

3. Ergo, Christian Baptism is in every case a pre-requisite to a participation of the *Lord's* Supper.

My Second Argument was this : Baptism is in every case pre-requisite to the Lord's Supper because the Divine Lawgiver placed it in this order in the commission. 1. Faith in Christ. 2. Baptism into Christ. 3. The observance of the Supper—it being among the "all things" He commanded to be observed. I showed that the *order* is as inviolable as the law itself, and is law itself, and to violate the order is to violate the law—to invert the order is to pervert and subvert the doctrine both of Baptism and of the Supper.

My Third Argument was the invariable observance of the order by the Apostles, by all the New Testament Churches, and by all professed Churches from the beginning until the practice was introduced by Methodist Societies—as a means of salvation to the unregenerate. Wall says "among all the absurdities that were ever held, none ever maintained that any person should partake of the communion before he was baptized."

The multiplied examples by the New Testament Churches is equivalent to law—if we had no prescribed order in the law itself.

My next Argument for the precedence of baptism over the Supper was the manifest symbolism of the Supper and the relationship of that symbolism to Christian Baptism.

One of the evident symbols of the Supper is that of sustentation—called the eating of the body and drinking of the blood of Christ by faith, on the part of the children of God—spiritual life must precede the partaking of spiritual food. Baptism symbolizes a resurrection unto spiritual life, and the Supper spiritual food—and not to follow baptism would symbolize what is repugnant to reason as well as the teaching of sacred Scriptures.

My next Argument was : That another symbol of the Supper, is the oneness of the Church and body of Christ—and the professed oneness with that visible body by each participant, oneness in its *faith*, and *hope*, oneness in the baptism that unites to His body. So that no unbaptized believer could symbolize this important doctrine, nor could he enjoy it any more than a limb dis severed from the parent body.

My final Argument, was : No unbaptized sinner can discern the Lord's body and for such to partake of it, would be to eat and drink condemnation to his own soul, and those religious teachers who dare to influence him to do so must certainly bring down a greater condemnation upon their own souls.

And I urged as an argument against the administration of it to sinners, and as a conclusive proof that it is a perversion—that in no case known to me, is it so administered, except as a *sacrament*, a means of imparting converting grace, *i. e.*, personal regeneration and salvation which is a corruption and perversion of the Gospel of Christ. “We have no such practice, neither the Churches of God.”

Then I crowned my Arguments with the concurrent testimony of the standard authors and writers of all denominations. If ever there was a question demonstratively proved I claim that this has been.

DR. DITZLER'S FIFTH REPLY

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—It is hard to get Dr. Graves to see that to draw near by faith—to be in love and charity with your neighbors in the Bible sense, having “repented of your sins,” does not apply to sinners and the unregenerate. And we had to tell him once that whatever be our defects, they gladly on all occasions, received our members into their church on the regeneration they professed in our church. Not only so, but, sad to tell, they have *habitually* to our *certain knowledge*, received into their church our *expelled* members and *ministers*, when expelled on charges of immorality. We can give “a local habitation and a name,” where it occurred in Kentucky. So that point is settled.

He has tried hard to impress you that we do not represent Methodism on this proposition. If we did not represent it, strange we should be called on over all the South to represent her on so many important occasions. We have been perfectly willing to allow Dr. Graves to represent Baptism on all points in this Debate. There is a good reason for his trying to impress you with the idea that I do not represent my church. He has seen and felt that (1) our position cannot be attacked with any hope at all. 2. That his is utterly demolished. 3. That from our stand-point, a ruinous campaign can be carried on against their position, and that peace conquered in shorter style than is pleasant to Baptists. He assumes that the woman in the wilderness is his church. Where is the proof? He has no church till 1606 to 1607—it was General. Arminian, Open-Communion Baptist—a people they now utterly excommunicate. How is this? He tells of somebody here ready and anxious to debate these historical questions with me. Well, Dr. Graves has more endorsement than any body else—I’d rather meet him.

He still harps on one baptism. Now cannot Dr. Graves understand that when Paul says of the ordinances of the Jews

that there were "divers baptisms," and of the apostolic days, Heb. vi. 2, they were to leave the doctrine of baptisms—plural—when there was the baptism with water, baptism with the Spirit, baptism with fire—cannot he see that there is a *plurality*, and that the only way to reconcile a seeming contradiction is to refer the one baptism to the Spirit, as the source of unity and real fellowship, instead of to water baptism? There was but one Lee, one Washington; yet you point to that picture in your parlor, and say that is Washington, this Lee, that Grant—yet you mean they are representatives, mere shadows of these great men. All understand you. So Paul, to the same effect, Rom. ii. 28, 29, says "he is not a Jew who is one outwardly." He says that is "not circumcision which is outward in the flesh." So that is not the baptism that is outward, in the flesh, it is merely symbolic baptism—not a real purifying power, but only symbolic of it.

As to Hawks, I care not for Hawks or Owls, but what say the apostles and Christ.

In his syllogisms, he assumes the point in debate—a matter exposed enough already. In the times before 1784 there were a few societies—the first meeting of which occurred in 1774 as an association. They were organized into a separate church 1784–5 as we detailed before. As did many Baptists, so did some Methodists in the rise of the war of 1776, and as Spurgeon would do to-day, and as Dr. Graves would do were he in England, so did some Methodists in that age. Weak is the cause that needs sympathy by such efforts as these the Doctor has made. We now review our arguments in part. We began by showing—

1. THE POSITION OF BAPTISTS.—They hold that you 1. must be immersed, they the judge, 2. When a proper believer, 3. By a proper administrator, 4. Baptized for the proper purpose, Howell 195; J. R. Graves LL.D., *The Baptist*, July 4, 1868, *Texas Baptist Pulpit*, 19.

They ought to be sure they are right. 1. As to immersion. That has been examined. 2. Suppose the immersed party be not a regenerate believer, when immersed, yet afterwards by God's grace is regenerated, he is (1) not a member, (2) he is

not baptized, (3) he has no right to the communion, according to Baptist doctrines. 3. If the administrator be not in Baptist succession, by their decisions, he is not baptized. This leads into the mazes of succession, which we will take up duly.

2. HISTORY OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.—Let us examine next into the Paschal Feast. 1st. (1) In Exodus xii, 3–28 it was instituted and celebrated before baptism was ordained or practiced. (2) Baptism occurs first, Ex. xiv, 1 Cor. x, 1, 2. (3) Formally ordained, Ex. xxx, 18–22; xl, 30–32; practiced Lev. viii, 6, under the word wash. 2d. The Lord's Supper was ordained and eaten (1) before baptism was announced as an ordinance of the church at all; (2) Baptism was never practiced by Christ personally, therefore subordinate, inferior in place to the Lord's supper which Christ personally administered. (3) It was not even known, not to say settled, so far as the record goes, that baptism was to be performed at all in the future.

It was ordained Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

3. Lord's Supper taken before Christ organized any visible church from a Baptist stand-point.

4. The history of its institution does not show it.

(1) Nothing in it shows baptism as a precedent.

(2) Judas took it. If he was not converted, of course not baptized, from *your* stand-point. If he was converted and baptized, then lost.

Mark thus reads, xiv: And as they sat and did eat, Jesus said, Verily I say unto you, one of you which eateth with me shall betray me. And they began to be sorrowful, and to say unto him one by one, Is it I? and another said is it I? And he answered and said unto them, *It is one of the twelve that dippeth with me in the dish.* The son of man indeed goeth, as it is written of him: but woe to that man by whom the son of man is betrayed! good were it for that man if he had never been born. And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave to them, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them; and they all drank of it."

He was left by Christ to assume the responsibility of it. Examine yourselves. He affirmed repeatedly, and in last speech especially. Eph. ii, 15, to "make in himself of twain *one new man*,"—he says "new church,"—and when Gentiles

came in it was a new church." That is, it was church on the Mount—was a new church. Gentiles come in *eleven years* later—yet *that* was the "*new church!*" Such are a few of his inconsistencies. They had better settle when the church was established.

4. *Paul's Record*, 1 Cor. xi, 16–29; x, 16, 21:

"Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. But he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body."

"The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we being many are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread."

Here is the qualification given. It perfectly accords with that of Christ. Partaking of Christ spiritually, is here the condition of membership to all partakers of the Lord's Supper—and condition of taking it. His position is far more severe than all teaching of Old and New Testaments.

5. Analogy of Scripture and God's design in ordinances, when sacrifices *could not* be secured or offered, when oil could not be had, circumcision performed, Josh. v, 1–8 omitted forty years, yet Gen. xvii, 9, 14, Aaron even transgressed the law, not eating the sin-offering of the people. Moses allows it, Lev. x, 16–20; Joshua against Medad and Eldad prophesying in the camp, not first going to the Lord at the tent door of the tabernacle, he wished Moses to forbid them, Num. xi, 16–26; yet Moses rebukes him, and prays for *more* such prophets. 2 Chron. xxx, 13–26, people came to the Passover in an undue manner, and ate it otherwise than as the law directed, and at Hezekiah's prayer all was sanctioned.

6. The object of the Supper, (1) "Do this in remembrance of me." Baptism is not a necessary condition of that. (2) The qualification is, "Let a man *examine himself*"—"Discern the Lord's body."

7. By Baptist rules, no one can take it.

(1). Which of their various orders is "the Baptist Church?" Who is to settle that?

The first branch, founded by Smyth, 1606 to 1608, self-constituted, became Arians in large part, as Benedict, Cramp, and other Baptists state. The founder of the Calvinistic wing, Spilsbury, had been an Episcopalian. Whence his baptism? So R. Williams, Clark, all of them got their baptism irregularly. *No chain exists.*

(2.) Apostolic succession, *so-called*. "Texas Baptist Pulpit," vol. I. p. 18, 19 (1873):

"The properly appointed officers of a government alone can administer its laws (18)." "Neither Scripture nor reason authorizes us to recognize any man at this day, as an official minister of the Gospel, but one appointed to that office by a church of Jesus Christ, nor any pretended administrations of the ordinance of baptism as *valid*, except those performed by a *properly authorized* administrator."

See also pp. 258, 259, 260. Of all, save Baptists: "They are *all usurpers* and *rebels against the government of Christ's church*. Truth requires us to view and treat them as such." (Texas Bap. Pul. i. 265.)

DR. J. R. GRAVES.—"No *Pedobaptist* or *Campbellite* is authorized to preach the Gospel." "But even if these ministers had been duly baptized by a regular Baptist church, holding the errors they do, they should promptly be excluded, and thereby denied both the pulpit and fellowship of the church, and, of course, denied the administration of, or participation in, the ordinances of the church." "The Campbellite was immersed to secure *and the regeneration of his heart*," and if a genuine Campbellite, "he has no other change of heart than that he received *in the water*." (The Baptist, July 4, 1868, editorial by J. R. Graves.)

If UNIMMERSED people *cannot* take the Lord's Supper *because unbaptized*, how can such baptize people and administer the *capacity* so necessary to take it?

(1). In Tertullian's day till fourth century, three immersions were required for one baptism, and three mostly when by immersion, till thirteenth century.

(2). The Anabaptists of Germany had no baptism save from the affusions of the Roman church.

(3). The Baptists of England had none, save the sprinkling of English "priests."

(4). The American Baptists had none save that by Roger Williams, Holliman, etc. Backus' Hist. Bap. Lib. 1. 90, 102-3; Benedict's Hist. 462-3, 465, 450; Clark's 1st. Church, 1644; Cramp, Randall, etc., etc.

By these principles we have *no proof* of a church at all in the world.

8th. They admit it is a church ordinance, *Texas Baptist Pulpit*, vol. i, 258–260; Baptist Library, Howell, Encyclopedia, Art. Baptist. But we have proved, 1. That all Christians are members of Christ's Church. 2. We proved that we, as Methodists, are churches. We have demonstrated that all saved, all regenerate people are in the church. God's Church consists of all his saved. Eph. ii, 16–21; Heb. xi, xii, 1–24; 1 Cor. xii, 12, 13, etc. etc.

9th. As such, having partaken of the blood spiritually; having eaten of the bread spiritually, John vi, 49–51, 54–58; 1 Cor. x, 3, 4, 16; having been baptized spiritually, 1 Cor. xii, 13; Acts xi, 15, 16; i, 5; Matt. iii, 11 etc. They are entitled to the symbols who have the substance. All regenerate people have Christ formed in them, are partakers of the Divine nature, and are entitled at once to the symbol that represents that fact.

The commission, Matt. xxviii, 19, 20, teaching them to observe all things. They say. 1st. Teach or disciple. 2d. Baptize them. 3d. Teach to observe all, etc., of which the Lord's Supper is a part. Howell, 37; Judd's Review of M. Stuart, 120; Dr. Graves' *Baptist*, Sept. 18, '75.

1. Cannot people be Christ's disciples before baptized, Hence take the Supper? Matt. iv, 18–22; ix, 9, 10, "his disciples."

2. While this is right, the general rule, are those who cannot be at the moment baptized, to be denied, when even in Old Testament times, no such rigid enforcement of the letter was allowed?

3. Do you debar those—all those who fail to do all Christ commands them to do? Why make an external rite supersede the far greater matters of the law? Hence it is pure, unadulterated Pharisaism—bigotry.

4. It is remarkable that the three most illustrious lights you Baptists ever had or ever will have—Robt. Hall, John Bunyan and Spurgeon, were and are open communionists.

5. It is assumed that the Apostles promptly and at once always baptized their converts, Howell, 40, etc. This is utterly untrue. Acts x, 44–47; 1 Cor. i, 15–17. No record

in the Bible where any of the twelve Apostles ever baptized anybody?

6. It makes the Christian system far more rigid, and attaches far more value and importance to outward forms than the Jewish system did.

This has been seen in that though circumcision was commanded with this declaration, Gen. xvii. 11th, 14th verses.

“And the uncircumcised man-child whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant—”

Yet Josh. v. 5, 6. “Now all the people that came out were circumcised but all the people *that were* born in the wilderness by the way as they came forth out of Egypt, *them* they had not circumcised. For the children of Israel walked forty years in the wilderness, till all the people *that were* men of war, which came out of Egypt, were consumed, because they obeyed not the voice of the LORD: unto whom the LORD sware that He would not show them the land, which the LORD sware unto their fathers that he would give us, a land that floweth with milk and honey.”

Aaron did not eat, Lev. x. 16–22; Eldad and Medad did not literally obey God, Num. xi. 24–26; David ate the shew bread Matt. xii. 4; Abraham by intention alone obeyed God, offering Isaac; indeed, the whole scheme of Redemption goes on the plan of will for deed, through a substitute which constitutes repentance. The Baptist system repudiates all that in its blind intolerance. It then has its succession—the so-called chain of connected baptisms running from apostolic times until to-day, through a host of sects, among them the Massalians, a sect separated from Catholics on matters as repulsive to Baptists as Catholics in the main, and their baptism from them—Montanists, are another link, a people whose faith was excessively pernicious, holding among other heresies that a *man* was the promised Spirit. The Novationists began with Novatian whose baptism was by sprinkling, as Dr. Graves will not deny. He has quoted it during this debate. The Donatists like all these parties, were Catholics, save one sect who went off before the title was taken. All these parties had bishops, priests, etc., in the Catholic sense, and baptized infants. They run in through Manichæans, a horrid sect, who rejected *all* baptism, holding that water, man, and physical elements were created by the devil. All these details we gave you

before and need not repeat them now. They run this wild Baptist myth in through Paulicians, Paternines, Waldenses, Albigenses, Leonists, Berengarians, Picards, Arnoldists, *Gies.* iii. 51; *Ford*, 101, Petrobussians, Henricians, Lollards, Wickliffites, Hussites, German Anabaptists, and all these parties.

We now arraign the Baptists as responsible for untold evils in the church. No wonder they have been rather the pets of Rome. But for the Anabaptists, the reformation would have swept over all Europe, carried Spain, Portugal, France, Italy, in its onward sweep, and blotted out that bane of civilization—the man of sin. We owe it to these misguided fanatics that Rome overshadows the welfare and threatens the peace of Europe to-day. On the contrary, the advance of Methodism was the signal of triumph, of glory and of good will. She found Protestantism prostrate, civilization dying, and the Baptist church a corpse. She raised up the one, revived the other, and took the dead corpse into warm and sympathetic proximity to her young and vigorous heart, and warmed it into life. Ours is a record of which a people may well be proud. We warred on no church. We assailed no denomination. We invited the co-operation of all God's people. We never sought to pull down, but to build up. At the sound of her bugle, at the call of her trumpet, an army of heroes sprang to the front, and marshaled themselves into line. Such is Methodism—organized Christianity—moral forces wielded by a muscular Christianity, not by blue ribbons and red tape insipidity.—[*Time out.*

THE
GREAT CARROLLTON DEBATE.

FOURTH PROPOSITION.

THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH AT CARROLLTON, MISSOURI,
POSSESSES THE SCRIPTURAL CHARACTERISTICS OF A CHURCH
OF CHRIST, OR A BRANCH OF THE SAME.

DR. DITZLER Affirms.
DR. GRAVES Denies.

[DR. DITZLER'S OPENING SPEECH.]

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS :—It will sound strangely in the ears of intelligent people everywhere, that we should be called upon to affirm such a proposition for serious discussion. A hundred years hence the discussion of to-day will be read with the same curious interest with which we read of the witchcraft at Boston, at Salem ;—of the superstitions that sent Mrs. Hutchinson to the wilderness, and that made Tam O'Shanter a rich and readable burlesque. It is a shame and disgrace to the Baptists of the South and West that such superstitions and bigotry should cling to them in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. But I have learned by personal observation, as well as reading, that the great body of Southern and Western Baptists profess to believe the negative of this proposition. Dr. Graves is pre-eminently the soul, the inspiration, and, of course, the ablest defender of their position.

This brings up the question of the church, already disposed of on Infant Baptism. A vast amount of matter there in my first two speeches, would belong here, but need not be repeated, yet remembered and accepted as a basis—the point of departure.

We shall present our argument then, with the solid and never assailed facts already put in evidence in the second proposition, addresses 1 and 2, accepted by you, my auditors; and then proceed with the following facts:

1. God has a people whom we call "The Universal Church"—all in heaven and earth who are in a saved relation to God, through Christ—who, were they to die as they are, would be saved. Heb. xi, entire, compared with xii: 1, 2, 22; Eph. iii: 14; Rev. vii: 9-14; xxi: 2, 3, 4.

2. The invisible church on earth—all who are in a saved relation to him—whose names are in the book of life. This was elaborately proved under the second proposition. We add the following additional proofs;

1. The New Testament everywhere shows that all aliens, or sinners, are made members of his church by virtue of spiritual renovation, in the act of which they are adopted into his family, household, which is the church of God. (1). The church is thus designated as a Flock, Sheepfold, with Christ as Shepherd; and all who have their spiritual food, protection and safety in him, are recognized as equally of this fold. John x: 1-16; Acts xx: 28-29, &c. Christ is the door, John x: 9, not baptism. (2). The church is represented as the body, Christ the head, and all who come into it from the state of aliens come in by the adopting Spirit. Eph. i: 22-23; Col. i: 18-24; Rom. xii: 4-5; Eph. iv: 16, &c., tell you that Christ is the head of the body, the church—head over all things to the church, which is his body. All who are in fellowship, in communion with Christ, spiritually, are of this body. But how do these parties come into this body, his church? 1 Cor. xii: 13—"By one Spirit are we all baptized into One body."

3. 1 Cor. x: 17 shows the same truth. "For we, being many, are one bread (one element unbroken), and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread"—Christ. See verses 2 and 3, also. All who spiritually partake of Christ the bread from heaven, John vi: 48, 50 and 51, all who eat thereof by faith are one bread, one undivided church—one body—one family, one household, one sheepfold.

4. The church is represented as embracing all who are

sanctified or saved. 1 Cor. 1 2—"with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ," "all who are sanctified in Christ Jesus." They are of the church.

5. The church is called household, family, and all who are regenerated, born of the Spirit, are thereby adopted into the same, 1 Tim. iii: 15—"in the household (*oiko*) of God, which is the church of the living God." How are we brought into this household? Eph. ii: 19-22, tells us we come into the household of God, as foreigners, aliens,—into the building, the holy temple "through the Spirit."—All who "walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham which he had, being yet uncircumcised," Rom. iv: 12, show that no ordinance, or outward form, makes us members of Christ's family or church, but faith in Christ. Hence the oneness of the church consists only in those fundamental principles that are in all ages, to all responsible moral beings, the condition of salvation, and hence never change—are unity—one. Hence Rom. viii: 14, "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye * * have received the Spirit of adoption. * * The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God, heirs of God." Here all who have the Spirit are sons, children, heirs of God, joint heirs with Christ. But God's children, sons, heirs, adopted, are his household, family. But he says the family, the household of God, is the church of the living God; 1 Tim. iii: 15. He says the flock of God, is the church; Acts xx: 28-29. We could extend these arguments almost endlessly, but these are enough, and such as Dr. Graves will never attempt to answer.

The truth of this is conceded by all enlightened Baptists of the East, and all of a former day. Prof. Ripley, who has no superior in the Baptist Church in Europe or America, says: "Those communities of Christians who have abandoned the primitive practice in respect to baptism, are churches, not in a state of order, so far as the positive ordinances * * are concerned." Baptist Library, vol. iii: p. 214.

John Bunyan: "The whole church. This word comprehendeth all the parts of it, even from Adam to the very world's

end. * * Now that baptism makes a man a member of this church I do not yet believe, nor can you show me why I should." Complete works, 879. That is and has always been exactly my position. So Roger Williams, Clarke, Backus, Benedict and all the best scholars of the Baptist church always held, and all the best historians among them know that all this parade about succession, that old woman they have hid in the wilderness, not the pure one of Scripture, is a bastard, a fiction, a myth, without one word of reason, Scripture, history, truth, or fact in its favor—gotten up by such pernicious and vicious writers as Orchard, who falsifies all history, misquotes all records and facts as wholes, distorts, and makes all history a huge burlesque, to impose on the ignorant. Even Benedict, after a course he is ashamed of, never puts it in his own hand, but in quotations, and Ford, Dr. Cramp and all, have to fall back on "principles" as the only reliable thing at last.

2. We next show that church existence, hence church oneness—unity—consists not of, depends not on, ordinances, ritualistic services—never did—never can.

1. It consists not in a succession of ministers in lineal connection or dependence.

(1) For ages the head of the family was priest, or minister, even till Moses. Each father was a priest, was the expounder of verity, minister. (2) From Moses there was a regular line of ministers, yet often interrupted by violence, conquests, invasions, civil wars. Along beside it, (3) God raised up extra ministers, the prophets, taken from the fields of labor, the vineyard, the pasture or the plow. Here is no lineal connection. The call or appointment of heaven is sufficient. (4) John the Baptist and Christ are vastly different in their ministry, and all the sacred writers, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, Peter, take special pains to point it out with emphasis—one baptizes with water—the other with the Spirit—with fire, telling of purity. One baptizes "unto repentance." The other baptizes those who have repented, believed on him—"thoroughly purges his floor." This brings out the fact.

2. That it consists not in ordinances.

(1) This has been established already by establishing the

opposite truth—that the Spirit adopts us into the church when it begets in us the principle of sonship. (2) For over two thousand years there is no record of outward ordinances as a ritualistic service, circumcision being the first recorded as commanded, in Abraham's day. Gen. xvii: 11-14. (3) It was purely symbolic. Gen. xvii: 11; Rom. ii: 28-29; iv: 11; Col. ii: 11, &c. (4) Circumcision was suspended forty years in the wilderness, no one circumcised. Yet the word church, is constantly applied to them during that time by Jehovah. So Stephen, Acts vii: 38. (5) When baptism came in, Moses baptizes Aaron and his sons, but who baptized Moses? Who baptized John the Harbinger? (6) In the Mosaic day, the ordinances came in gradually through a series of years—many years. Was it no church till all these were completed, or on what proportion or part of them did the existence of the church depend? (7) So as to Christ. He gradually reformed, restored, built up, purified, elevated. The Lord's Supper came in before crucifixion. Baptism ordained forty days after the resurrection. Gentiles brought in eight to ten years after Pentecost. Certain meats, customs, old ordinances done away years after Gentiles are brought in. Acts xv and xxi entire, with Gal. iii entire. The apostolic church practiced infant circumcision during the entire apostolic age. Here we see how gradually changes all came in. Paul was found "purified in the temple" as late in apostolic history as Acts xxiv: 18. All these facts, that could be multiplied indefinitely, utterly destroy and grind into dust all Baptist and red tape theories of church existence.

2. Hence church existence depends alone upon the regeneration and adoption of aliens into God's spiritual family of the saved, they are added to the Lord—the Lord adds them. Acts ii: 47; v: 14. And its oneness consists in the unchangeableness of the principles by which people are saved.

The essential principles of salvation have been the same, always, since the fall, and have reigned through all dispensations, and constitute the oneness of God's church in all time—through all dispensations. See further, Gen. vi: 3-5; xv: 6,

with Rom. iv: 3-11; Is. liii: 4, 5, 6, 10; Ps. li entire; Is. i. 16-18; iv: 4; Heb. x: 38-39, continued to xi entire, xii: I, 2, 22; 1 Tim. i: 5; 1 Pet. i: 9; Rom. xiii: 13; xiv: 17, 18; with 1 Cor. x: 2-3; Deut. vi: 4-5; Mark xii: 28-33, &c., &c.

3. In the Old and New Testaments, any number of those parties who are in a saved relation to God, could, and did associate themselves together, organize themselves, if you prefer, unite together, and worship, administer and receive the proper ordinances of God's appointment, and they were a visible church, a congregation. To such association of them, Christ refers: Matt. xvii, 17-20; the apostle John, Epistle 3d, verses 9 and 10; James ii, 2, etc.

Now, baptism does not initiate into, or make the parties members of, such local congregation.

1. The Bible nowhere teaches it. Let the place be found. Of what local church was Philip, and of what local congregation did his baptism make the traveling Eunuch a member? Did Ananias make Pual a member of his congregation when he baptized Paul, or Peter constitute Cornelius and his house members of the church at Jerusalem, or of Joppa, where he was lodging? Of what local congregation did the Baptist make Christ a member, or John the multitudes of his baptism? You see how infinitely absurd the Baptist position.

The voluntary action of a man, and the concurrence of the congregation, constitute the man a member of the church or local congregation; not the baptism. This is effected in most cases among all churches of the land, by letter in many cases: by a vote in absence of a letter often, he applying, they thus concurring. Let us suppose a case, to see how absurd is the initiatory theory. Suppose some member who stands high in your church accuses a prominent member of vicious, wicked words, and deeds. He is arraigned, tried, expelled. Is he now a member of the local, visible church? No, he is expelled—is clear out. So we find 3 John, verses 9 and 10—one who is ever wicked, expelled the good members by his vast influence. Well, now the accuser after a year or so dies, confesses he lied—slandered the one you expelled. The expelled man remains pious, all proofs thereof are evident. What

do you do? By a unanimous vote you restore him—make him a member of your church—of the local congregation. We could explode, by many facts and practices well known, all these old dark age superstitions about initiatory rites, etc. We hold this to be the great underlying principle of our church action—that as they are members of Christ's invisible church, are in being, so they can assemble, baptize, administer the Lord's Supper, ordain ministers, etc. All churches at some period have acted on this principle—Catholic, English, Episcopal, Baptist always did, till this wild heresy got into the heads of a part of their leaders, Methodists, Lutherans, Presbyterians, Disciples. It is the truth they all fall back on at last. Baptism is no more necessary as an absolute condition of membership, than is the Lord's Supper. Both are to be administered rightly, properly. To refuse any of our important or solemn duties is to rebel against God and forfeit his favor and consequently our spiritual fellowship, wherein we lose the grand right and titles to visible or outward fellowship, membership. In this position, Revelation, Reason, universal and necessary Practice all harmonize, and in no other. Hence, this congregation of Methodists in Carrollton are a part, a branch of Christ's church.

They are all baptized, even if it depended on that, by the primitive, apostolic mode—all is right any way.

Let us glance now into Apostolic history, and see whether our view is supported, or the congregational views of the Baptists, together with a repudiation and destruction of the old church, with the organization of a radically different one.

1. From Moses till Christ, the church was not congregational. This will not be questioned. While they, just as Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Methodists had their visible assemblies, synagogues and temple worship the church was a unity—one. See Numbers, xxvii, 15-23; e. g.

2. Christ and John found it thus.

(1) Let it be pointed out now where John ever organized separate churches; (2) on a congregational basis; (3) separate from the Jews. Dr. Graves has admitted (Prop. 2.) that John never organized a church—that in fact none existed in his day.

3. With these facts settled, where did Christ, in his day, organize and officer congregations? Find it if you can. No effort has been made, not even where infant baptism demanded that such effort be made if it could be, to get rid of the oneness of the church. Well does Bunyan, the great Baptist, say, "John gathered no particular church." *Complete Works*, 829, "Reason of my Practice." Nay, Christ uses the term church once in its full sense, Matt. xvi, 18; twice in its limited sense as a local congregation, Matt. xviii. 17. During all Christ's sojourn he never organized those who believed on him; those whom he pardoned and blessed, into separate existence as churches or congregations any more than did John.

4. In apostolic times the facts are plain—the records simple. (1) All who finally at Christ's crucifixion, had rejected him, who had failed to receive him, they were put on a level with all Gentiles, from the day of the crucifixion and resurrection, all were placed on a level, (Eph. ii, 16 and 22; Rom. iii, 1 and 9; xi, entire; Acts ii, 39; x, 34 and 35), and had to come in as all Gentiles did. (2) Acts i, 23–26, as a whole, the apostles elect one in the place of Judas, and not on the congregational basis. They ignore such a thing, know not of it. (3) Acts ii, 4–11, that great body from every nation under heaven, on whom with the apostles, the Holy Spirit falls, to "them" the three thousand converts, verse 41, "are added." Where is the new congregation, with officers, etc., appointed. They "continued in the temple," verse 46, "daily." (4) Acts vi. 1–4. "The multitude of the disciples" were called in with "the twelve" apostles to look out seven proper deacons "whom we may appoint." Here is an utter opposition to all congregational ideas.

Instead of each separate congregation electing its deacons, etc., here the apostles all, and the brethren as a whole do it, and "appoint" them. (5) So Acts viii, 6–8, 12–14, the apostles that were at Jerusalem send Peter and John to Samaria to Superintend matters, on the same principle. (6) Acts xi. 1, 2, 5, 18, 22, the apostles and brethren that were in Judea, take charge and cognizance of Peter's course in the house of Cornelius; x, 38–47. (7) Philip (Acts viii, 38) is on the same

principle. (8) Acts xv, 1, 3, 19, 22, 24, 28, 36, show that the apostles and elders at Jerusalem legislate for the whole body of congregations. So we could trace it all the way through. The true position is, therefore, to avoid in church government central power on the one hand, and mobocracy, i. e., no government but the overbearing, undefined, unrestrained power of a majority, unchecked by limitations and restrictions, on the other.

Methodism has most beautifully, like the apostolic church, taken this happy middle ground. Hence her grand success.

IV We next refer to those Scriptures that tell us "by their fruits ye shall know them." By this shall they be known as His disciples. This leads us to trace the origin of the Methodist church. To do this we must take a correct view of the religious and spiritual condition of England and the American colonies in the eighteenth century. After the long civil wars of Europe in the seventeenth century, the Protestant churches exhausted themselves in the fierce conflicts of half a century to a century. In the civil conflicts under Charles I. and Cromwell, in which Presbyterians, Episcopalians and Independents mutually destroyed each other—the age of Charles II came on in 1661—"a period of wild and desperate dissoluteness followed."

The age of Charles II came on. "A period of wild and desperate dissoluteness followed.

In London the outbreak of debauchery was appalling. The character of the drama became conformed to the character of the patrons." "All professions of piety were treated by the rule of courtesy." It was doubted by the leaders of fashion and by the pet poets whether there was such a thing as virtue in the world. Macaulay says: "Profligacy became a test of orthodoxy and loyalty—a qualification for rank and office. A deep and general taint infected the morals of the most influential classes, and spread itself through every province of letters. Poetry inflamed the passions; philosophy undermined the principles; divinity itself, inculcating an abject reverence for the court, gave additional effect to its licentious examples." "In the fashionable libertinism there is a hard, cold ferocity, an impudence, a lowness, a dirtiness, which can be paralleled only among the heroes and heroines of the filthy and heartless literature which encouraged it." The dramatists of the Restoration, 1660-1688, far exceeded Beaumont and Fletcher in wanton innuendoes and allusions. The age of Louis XIV in France was not more depraved than that of Charles II in England. "They everywhere confounded free mental vivacity and the coarsest licentiousness. After all

we know of the licentiousness of manners under Charles II, we are still lost in astonishment at the audacious ribaldry of Wycherly and Congreve. Decency is not merely violated in the grossest manner in single speeches, and frequently in the whole plot; but in the character of the rake, the fashionable debauchee, a moral skepticism is *directly* preached up, and marriage is the constant subject of their ridicule.¹ Such was the corruptness of the times when Protestantism had to emerge from the Papacy. These writers elevated their genius to the work of clothing those women, whose licentiousness was at once revolting and unblushing, in the most attractive virtues, as possessed with every grace of demeanor, beauty, wit and taste. In "The Plaindealer," "Country Wife," "The Old Bachelor," "Love for Love," and "The Way of the World," we behold all these dark pictures. They fill the pages of Wycherly, Congreve, Vanbrugh, Farquhar, Dufey, Dryden, Cibber, Steele, Etherage and Smollet. The language of these men is too indecent to be quoted on the questions in hand; but the *moral* that closes one of the above plays ends thus:

"What rugged ways attend the noon of life!
Our sun declines, and with what anxious strife—
What pain we tug *that galling load—a wife!*"

The moral of "Love for Love" is—

"The miracle of to-day is that we find
A lover true, not that a woman's kind."

It was no better in other parts of Europe. The writings of Calderon, Lope de Vega and Cervantes abundantly confirm this. Ethrage's "She Would if She Could," Dryden's translation of the Fourth Book of Lucretius, and Wycherly's "Country Wife," received the imprimatur of the licenser. And these were the very days when the Wesleys were beginning their assaults upon an idle priesthood and a dying Church. Wycherley died, 1715; Congreve died, 1729; Methodism began, 1739. Schlegel writes: "It is a remarkable phenomenon the *causes* of which are deserving of *enquiry* that the *English nation*, in the *last half of the eighteenth century*—the very days when the Wesleys were in the zenith of their zeal and power—passed all at once from the most opposite way of thinking to an almost scrupulous strictness of manners in social conversation, in romances, in plays and in the plastic art."

This state of morals was bad enough; but, as might have been inferred, to this state of morals and morbid inactivity the morals and teachings of the clergy conformed. This is seen in all the literature just reviewed. Preaching was a cold, lifeless performance. It had no feeling—no emotion. It was without earnestness and without sympathy. They denied the fundamental principles of Christianity. Natural religion was their favorite study. Collins and Tindal denounced Christianity as *priestcraft*; Whiston pronounced the miracles of Christ Jewish impositions; Wollaston declared them to be allegories; Toland assaulted Christianity and contended for Pantheism; Lord Herbert, Mandeville, Earl Shaftsbury (1713) Morgan Chubb, Dodwell and Bolingbroke, all wrote with vigor in favor of the wildest theories. In 1710, the year after Wesley began to preach as a Reformer, Edelmann and Reimarus introduced Deism into Germany,

where it developed into rationalism, and has been productive of untold harm, threatening to overthrow Christianity where the Reformation began. Knutzen and Dippel assisted in this fanatical assault on religion. Arianism and Socinianism were openly avowed and defended by such men as Priestly, Samuel Clark and Whiston. In Rousseau's day the Geneva divines refused to answer whether Jesus Christ were God. As late as 1790, the words "in Christ"—*en christoo*—were reduced to a mere profession of the doctrine of Christ. In 1817 the venerable Society of Pastors enacted a law that every minister would be required, at his installation, to promise that he would not discuss certain principles of Calvinistic orthodoxy. This shows how distasteful were many of the principles held forth by the Church.

Even the most rigid churchmen present the state of morals among the clergy as most deplorable. Bishop Burnet, in the seventieth year of his age, says: "I cannot look on without the deepest concern, when I see the imminent ruin hanging over this Church, and, by consequence, over the whole Reformation. The outward state of things is black enough, God knows; but that which heightens my fears rises chiefly from the inward state from which we have unhappily fallen." Of the clergy he says: "Our ember weeks are the burden and grief of my life." He says the ministers were unacquainted with the Scriptures, and did not even read them. Nay, he declares they "were the greatest strangers to the easiest part of knowledge," and never "read any one good book." Watts says: "There was a general decay of vital religion in the hearts and lives of men;" that this declension of piety and virtue was common to Dissenters and churchmen, and that it was a general matter of mournful observation among all who lay the cause of God to heart. He urged that all should do what they could *for the recovery of a dying religion in the world*. It was complained that "vital religion was lost out of the world." Dr. Guiso said: "The present modish turn of religion looks as if we had no need of a mediator.

The religion of nature makes up the darling topics of our age; and the religion of Jesus is valued only so far as it carries on the light of nature. All that is restrictively Christian, or that is peculiar to Christ, is waived, and banished, and despised!" Archbishop Secker, a man venerable and learned, complains that, "In this we cannot be mistaken; that an open and professed disregard has become, through a variety of unhappy causes, the distinguishing character of the present age." Again: "Such are the dissoluteness and contempt of principles in the higher part of the world, and the profligacy, intemperance and fearlessness of committing crimes in the lower, as must, if this torrent of impiety stop not, become absolutely fatal. Christianity is ridiculed and railed at with very little reserve, and the teachers of it without any at all." It was taken for granted that Christianity was fictitious, and that the subject was no longer open to discussion. It was a "principle subject for mirth and ridicule." Southey, and Leighton, Archbishop of Glasgow, 1684, agree with the above, and declare that the Church was a fair carcass without a spirit. Taylor, a violent antagonist of Methodism in the Episcopal Church, admits that when Wesley

rose, the English Church was "an ecclesiastical system under which the people of England had lapsed into heathenism, or a state hardly to be distinguished from it;" and that "the languishing nonconformity of the last century—Dissenters—was rapidly in course to be found nowhere but in books." Hannah Moore writes in the same strain. Some idea may be formed when one of the brightest intellects of the age, and a Dean of the Church, employed his time in writing the adventures of Gulliver. Such ecclesiastics as Dean Swift and Sterne were given up wholly to wit and ribaldry. These witnesses were not of the Puritan stamp. It is the complaint of those of whose want of piety Puritans would have complained. Of the idleness of the Episcopal clergy, and their utter neglect of the Irish, Macaulay writes: "The English conquerors, meanwhile, neglected all legitimate means of conversion. No care was taken to provide the vanquished nation with instructors capable of making themselves understood. No translation of the Bible was put forth in the Erse language. The government contented itself with setting up a *vast hierarchy* of Protestant Archbishops, Bishops and Rectors, who did nothing, and who, for doing nothing, were paid out of the spoils of the Church." They passed their lives in remote manor houses, drinking ale and playing at shovel-board.

At this very time, when infidelity was everywhere triumphant in every form, active and vigilant, Catholicism was speedily and triumphantly recovering her loss, and from the wounds inflicted by the Reformation. In 1559 St. Xavier went to India and established the Romish religion. In South America they had missionaries among the Spanish along with Pizarro. Their priests were to be found following the conquests of every adventurer, and in the wigwams of the savages of both North and South America. They spared no pains—their zeal never flagged. In 1738 Ignatius Liguori set up Jesuitism in its fullest proportions. In addition to the gunpowder plot, the edict of Nantes was revoked, 1685, and the memorable slaughter of St. Bartholomew, 1572, and the long and almost triumphant efforts of the Charleses and the Jameses show how insecure was Protestantism. At the breaking out of the rebellion, in 1715, the great Francis Atterbury, once Dean of Christ Church, their Bishop and Prolocutor, and who, but for the fall of his party, would have been Archbishop of Canterbury, refused to sign the paper in which the Bishops of the province of Canterbury declared their attachment to the succession as against the usurper of the infamous house of Stuarts. On the contrary, they tried to have a James III proclaimed king.

Not only was there, at this time, a much more intense zeal among the Catholics than among the Protestants, but the whole zeal of the Catholics was directed against the Protestants, while almost the whole zeal of the Protestants was directed against each other. The whole force of Rome was, therefore, effective for the purpose of carrying on the war against the Reformation.

On the other hand, the force which ought to have fought the battle of the Reformation was exhausted in civil conflict. While Jesuit preachers, Jesuit confessors, Jesuit **teachers of youth**, overspread Europe, eager to expand every faculty of their minds

and every drop of their blood in the cause of their Church, Protestant doctors were confuting, and Protestant rulers were punishing sectaries who were just as good Protestants as themselves.

In England the jails were filled with men, who, though zealous for the Reformation, did not exactly agree with the court in all points of discipline and doctrine.

The Irish people might, at that time, have been reclaimed from Popery, at the expense of *half* the zeal and activity which Whitgift employed in oppressing Puritans and Martin Marprelate in reviling bishops.

As the Catholics, in zeal and unity, had a great advantage over the Protestants, so had they also an infinitely superior organization. In truth, Protestantism, for aggressive purposes, *had no organization at all*. The Reformed Churches were mere national churches. The Church of England existed *for England alone*. It was an institution purely *local*, as the Court of Common Pleas, and was utterly without *any machinery* for *foreign* operations. The Church of Scotland, *in the same manner*, existed for Scotland alone. The operations of the Catholic Church, on the other hand, *took in the whole world*.

Our Island—England—did not send out a single missionary or a single instructor of youth to the scene of the great spiritual war. Not a single seminary was established here for the purpose of furnishing a supply of such persons to foreign countries. On the other hand, Germany, Hungary and Poland were filled with able and active Catholic emissaries of Spanish or Italian birth, and colleges for the instruction of the Northern youth were founded at Rome. The spiritual force of Protestantism was a mere *local* militia, which might be useful (*at home*) in case of an invasion, but could not be used abroad, and could, therefore, make no conquests."

If the times from Elizabeth, 1559, to the close of the seventeenth century were depraved, those of the reigns of George II and George III were no better. The times of Louis XIV, in France, produced a Voltaire, a Volney and a Rousseau, and the times of George III produced a Gibbon, a Hume, a Bolingbroke and a Tom Paine. W. M. Thackeray, in his *Four Georges*, gives a sketch of those days: "The parsons at Oxford were double-dealing and dangerous as any priest out of Rome." He tells of "Rev. Mr. Hoadly cringing from one bishopric to another," in the days of George II. "Selwin has a chaplain and a parasite—one Dr. Warner." He speaks of "all the foul pleasures and gambols in which he (Warner) reveled (as) played out."

This worthy clergyman takes pains to tell us that he does not believe in his religion.

He comes home, "after a hard day's christening," as he says, and writes to his patron before sitting down to whist and partridges for supper. He is a boisterous, uproarious parasite.

He is inexpressibly mean—a tender-hearted knave.

Was infidelity endemic, and corruption in the air? Around the young king

lived a court society as dissolute as our country ever saw. George the Second's bad morals bore their fruit in George the Third's early years." He said Johnson was the support of the Church during that day, and "better than whole benches of bishops." Of George III, cotemporary of Wesley, he says: "The

theatre was always his delight. His bishops and clergy used to attend it, thinking it no harm to appear where that good (?) man was seen." When we try to recall social England, we must fancy it playing at cards for many hours every day. The custom has well-nigh gone out among us now [Why?], but fifty years ago it was general—fifty years before that (Wesley's rise) almost universal in the country. Seymour said, to be ignorant of gaming, was considered low-bred. "Books were not fit articles for drawing rooms, old ladies used to say. 'The only books I know,' said old Lady Marlborough, 'are men and cards.'" Even the nonconformist clergy looked not unkindly on the practice of playing cards. As for the High Church parsons, they *all* played, *bishops* and all.

Their majesties, the Prince of Wales and the Princesses, went to the *Chapel Royal* preceded by the heralds. The king and prince made offering at the altar, of gold, frankincense, myrrh, etc. At night their majesties played at hazard with the nobility for the benefit of the groom porter, and it is said the king won sixty guineas. "Lady Yarmouth sold a bishopric to a clergyman for five thousand pounds. She betted him five thousand (£5,000) pounds that he would be made a bishop, and he lost, and paid her. Was he the only prelate of his time led up by such hands for consecration? As I peep into George the Third's St. James', I see crowds of cassocks rustling up the back stairs of the ladies of the court; stealthy clergy slipping purses into their laps; the godless old king yawning under his canopy in his chapel royal as the chaplain before him is discoursing.

While the chaplain is preaching the king is chattering in German, almost as loud as the preacher—so loud that the clergyman, Dr. Jeny, absolutely burst out crying in the pulpit.

No wonder that the clergymen were corrupt and indifferent. No

wonder that skeptics multiplied and morals degenerated. No wonder

that Whitfield cried out in the wilderness—that Wesley quitted the insulted temple to pray on the hill-side. Which is the sublimer spectacle—the good John Wesley surrounded by his congregations of miners at the pit's mouth, or the queen's chaplains mumbling through their morning office in their ante-room

with the door opened into the adjoining chamber, where the queen is dressing, talking scandal to Lord Hervey, or uttering sneers at Lady Suffolk, who is kneeling with a basin at her mistress' side. I am scared, I say as I look around upon society—at this king, at these courtiers, at these *bishops*, at this flouting vice and levity."

Such was the condition of the European world in general, and of England in particular and her American colonies, when (1739) God raised up and thrust out the Wesleys and their coadjutors to save Protestantism, to save society, and restore Christianity. Remember that these are not Methodist authorities we have quoted—not one of them. They are standards the world over in their departments as writers, in different churches, and some of no church.

But what had the Baptists done? They were organized in England as early as 1608, in Wales by 1646, in the American colonies in 1639. In Germany all they, as such Baptists did, was to raise civil war, insurrection, anarchy and stop the reformation, paralyze Luther's hands and swell the shout of the Catholics all over Europe. They failed utterly till this day in Germany. In England they prospered in the seventeenth century for a while, but Benedict shows that they split to pieces, began a war on each other of the fiercest character, that resulted in complete ruin.

Benedict says that in the next century, eighteenth, the Baptists were not nearly so strong as in the preceding one. Socinianism, skepticism and proscription ruined them; each sect warring on the other, for they soon split up as here.

In the American colonies though organized by Roger Williams (1639), yet as late as 1768 there had not been organized a Baptist church in the states of Vermont or New Hampshire, and only nine in Massachusetts up to 1741; (Backus' History, vol. i. page 152). Not a second congregation in Vermont till 1773. (Backus', page 158).

Hear now Dr. Cramp, the latest standard Baptist historian in America, p. 471. "In 1688 the Baptist denomination [notice that word—they are as others, only a denomination,] in North America comprised THIRTEEN churches." Page 498 he says: "A sad degeneracy had taken place among the General Baptists. ARIANISM had crept in among them and with it certain other errors. THE LOSS OF LIFE FOLLOWED THE OBSCURATION OF LIGHT. Anti-evangelical sentiments prevailed to such an alarming extent that the sound hearted of that denomination felt the necessity of *withdrawment*. They peaceably withdrew in the year 1770, and formed the 'New Connection of General Baptists' The new body thus constituted is now the General Baptist denomination, the Arianized churches having fallen for the most part into Socinianism, or become extinct." Here is your apostolic successionism again. See how they come down, crushing all Dr. Graves' ideas of succession. Their "chief men were Supralapsarians." What saved them? Hear Dr. Cramp: "The back-sliding and cold-

ness had affected ALL religious communities in England. Had it not been for the merciful revival which accompanied the labors of Whitfield and the Wesleys, evangelical truth would have well nigh died out. Those extraordinary men were raised up for a glorious purpose. The effects of their ministry were felt by all denominations." And so he continues the account. "The restorative process did not take effect among the Baptists so soon as in some other denominations etc." p. 500. They were so VERY DEAD they had to be *put in soak* as it were, to enable them to receive profit. Once more says Cramp, p. 527. "In the year 1740, the number of churches was *thirty-seven*, with less than three thousand members!! Think of it—"In North America," the Baptists at the end of *one hundred and one years number less than three thousand members!!!* "BY THEIR FRUITS YE SHALL KNOW THEM." Think on these things—study them well, ye who love the truth. Notice that we rely on the unimpeachable statements of standard Baptist historians, not on the heated statements of enemies or disappointed, disaffected members. It was years yet before they began to flourish, as Benedict, Backus and Cramp show.

Here, then, after one hundred and thirty-five years of existence, the Baptist church was a total failure in America, and worse than a failure in Europe. If a church is to be judged by its fruit, by its work, by its good, look at the contrast between Methodism and Baptistism. Why is this? If Baptists could make good their ridiculous claim to have existed so long, it would be the strongest proof possible against their claim to be of God, since they did so little good anywhere, in any way yet so much harm, till Methodism came along and saved it, infused new life, better principles and a better policy into them. Methodism found them becalmed, dead, in absolute stagnation, a vessel half wrecked, quite deserted of officers and passengers, her sails hanging loose in the idle winds, almost gone, rigging in tatters, floating about in the waters, drifting with the current. Methodism organized the forces of Christianity. She re-established Protestantism. She was the Blucher of Christianity, and fought the Waterloo of its modern victory. Catholicism had regained her strength. She had recovered

from the surprise and recoiled from the defeat of 1520 to 1529. Everywhere she was marshaling her devoted and revengeful hosts to the front. Gustavus had barely saved it from annihilation, but that was purely a political victory and military salvation that could not last.

While these disasters everywhere threatened Protestantism, infidelity was hovering over the land like a dark and shadowy demon, spreading the most baneful influences in all the forms of society and relationships of life. The bonds of society were dissolving; crimes abounded; religion was mocked; her votaries held up as the butt end of a jest; theatres and the court of the Georges debauched the land, while a ministry of easy and loose virtues swayed between the foaming bowl, the card table and the pulpit. With these tremendous forces, each backed by crowned heads and bloated monarchs, the feeble church was in a death.—Thermopylic—struggle, when in the distance the soul-stirring notes of the advancing columns of Methodism were heard. They came on with more than the inspiring notes of the slogan of the mountains to an army weary, faint and in retreat. Their weapons were fresh from the armory of God—as the pattering rain before the tremendous torrent; as the stillness, the suspense, the rumbling before the upheaval of an earthquake; as the rattle of small arms before the roar of artillery, where the encircling batteries pour a sheet of flame and a storm of shell, of iron hail, on land and sky—so came in the advancing columns of Methodism to turn the waning fortunes of the church one hundred years ago. The blast of her bugle notes sounded a “forward, march!” along the whole wavering, retreating line. No column wavered. No pause was made. The trailing colors of other churches were raised aloft once more. Confidence and discipline were restored. The whole body of Protestant churches were aroused, inspirited and began a new career of usefulness and success. Toleration now began, and was put on a footing never thought of before. All the great engines of intellectual and moral power now known originated in Wesley’s great mind, and as the fruit of his movement became a success, viz: The missionary movements, tract societies, the Bible Society

free Sabbath schools, the itinerant system and the practical use of hymnology. Everything he touched turned to gold of a religious utility. To-day, in England, Methodism, next to the establishment, stands far in advance of any other body in intellect, pulpit force, influence, and beyond all in moral power. In the United States Methodism stands far in advance of any one sect or order of Christians, in numbers, in wealth, in colleges, in sittings for people, in books and literature—more than doubles the whole Baptist body her nine divisions, in wealth and numbers of adult members. Yet she is only ninety years old in America as an organized body. I follow the nation's statistics. The Baptists are two hundred and thirty-six years old in America. And is it possible with these achievements before us—having come to the perishing, sinking, drowning, almost strangled body of the Baptist church, like a passing Noah's ark, we reached down our hand and took her in, like the Savior who rescued perishing Peter—we are now asked to affirm that such a body is a church! And this poor, emaciated, starved little cripple, this dwarf of wrinkled age and hollow, consumptive voice, whose cheeks were flushed with the hectic fever of decay and death, the chronic patient of a hundred and sixty years, resened and healed by our generous hand, now answers us "BAPTISTS. DENY!"

DR. GRAVES' FIRST REPLY.

MR. PRESIDENT:—The question before us is, whether the *local* Methodist Society in Carrollton, known as the M. E. Church South, is a Scriptural Church, or *branch* of the same. It is not whether the organization known as the Baptist Church, here or elsewhere, is or is not. It was proposed to Elder Ditzler's Committee to deny that Baptist Churches possessed the Scriptural characteristics of Gospel Churches, and *they admitted in writing that they were true Churches of Christ*. The discussion of Baptist Churches therefore in no way enters into this discussion. I wish one thing to be distinctly understood, *i. e.*, the question is not whether the individual members of the Methodist Society here are *Christians* or not. In denying that the Society is a Church, I do not therefore deny that its members are Christians, nor in admitting it to be a true Church would it follow that all its members were Christians. I in no sense admit that making one a Church member, therefore makes him a Christian. Every member of an organization may be a Christian, but it does not follow that the organization was therefore a Church of Christ. Every member of the Masonic Lodge in this place may be a true Christian, but the Lodge is not therefore a Scriptural Church. I may unchurch an organization, *i. e.*, deny that it possesses the Scriptural characteristics of a Gospel Church and not thereby *unchristianize* its members. If my opponent should attempt to make the impression upon you that I deny that you are Christians because I deny your Society is a Church, he will pursue a course both unwarranted and unprincipled. There are a million of Baptists and millions who are not Baptists on this continent who do not believe that this local M. E. Society in Carrollton is a Church, nor is there a Methodist minister or Bishop on the continent who believes it, and I should think that each lay Methodist before me, or who may read this discussion would be anxious to know the reasons why the Society of which he

is a member is not a church—and if it is a fact, at once leave it and seek membership in a body that is. Before entering upon the discussion, I would direct the attention of all to the singular course Elder Ditzler has pursued in his opening speech. The very first thing he was in duty bound to do as a debater was to define what he claimed the Scriptural characteristics of a Scriptural Church to be, and then have shown if he could, that the M. E. Society here, possessed these characteristics. The first rule in Hedge's Logic says that each disputant shall define his terms. But Elder Ditzler has not done so. He persistently refused to define a church, that had ordinances, during the three days we discussed the second proposition, and he has opened this without doing it. I now call upon him to do so when he rises,—and to give me his definition in writing. If he declines, I here ask him in your hearing if he will accept the definition as it stands in Art. xiii. and xxii. of his Discipline. If he refuses to define his terms he refuses to discuss—he intends only to *wrangle*.

My first reason for denying that the M. E. Society in this town is a Church is—

I. BECAUSE THE METHODIST DISCIPLINE DECLARES THAT IT IS NOT.

(1) It is well known that John Wesley who originated the system known as Methodism never intended to make a *Church*, and warned his people against doing so. He denominated the religious organizations, he formed *Societies*, in all his writings and in his will. He certainly ought to know what they are.

(2) In the address of the ten acting Bishops of the General Conference South 1866, they not only admit that Wesley called them Societies, but they themselves do so and certainly they, if anybody, ought to know. I quote from that address:

DEARLY BELOVED BRETHREN :—"We think it expedient to give you a brief account of the rise of Methodism both in Europe and America. " In 1729, two young men, in England, reading the Bible, saw they could not be saved without holiness, followed after it and incited others so to do. In 1737, they saw, likewise, that men are justified before they are sanctified; but still holiness was their object. God then thrust them out to raise a holy people "

"In the year 1766, Philip Embury, a local preacher of our Society, from Ireland, began to preach in the city of New York, and formed a Society

of his own countrymen and the citizens; and the same year, Thomas Webb preached in a hired room near the barracks. About the same time Robert Strawbridge, a local preacher from Ireland, settled in Frederick county, in the State of Maryland, and preaching there, formed some Societies."

I now quote from the body of the Discipline to show you that throughout the land the local organizations, like this at Carrollton are not only not *called* Churches, but always Societies,—and that they are declared not to be Churches—that these are not M. E. Churches in the South, but only *one* body called the M. E. Church in all these Thirteen States of the South. If I do this, I have certainly disproved the proposition, and I will have done one thing more—justified myself and all others who, wishing to give organizations their proper names, are accustomed to call all local M. E. Societies like this, *Societies*.

You will turn to Discipline and read page 9.

"The preachers and members of our *Society* in general, being convinced that there was a great deficiency of vital religion in the Church of England in America", etc.—

"The Nature, Design, and General Rules of our United Societies.

(2.) This was the rise of the UNITED SOCIETY, first in *Europe* and then in *America*. Such a Society is no other than "*a company of men having the form and seeking the power of godliness, united in order to pray together, to receive the word of exhortation, and to watch over one another in love, that they may help each other to work out their salvation.*" p. 31-32.

This body here at Carrollton then is only a company of men, having the *form* and seeking the power of Godliness—not a body of *professed* Christians—but a religious Society only—says the Discipline :

(4.) "There is only one condition previously required of those who desire admission into these Societies, a "desire to flee from the wrath to come, and to be saved from their sins." p. 33-34.

They are *Societies*, not *Churches*. The Young Men's Christian Associations in America are Societies not *Churches*, though no one can tell how soon they will assume the title,—but it will be an act of impiety and rebellion to Christ when they do it.

I read again on page 38 :

(7.) "These are the general rules of our Societies," etc.

And on page 43 where the powers of General Conference are limited and the *rules* of local bodies like this at Carrollton

protected—this and all other bodies like it in the South are denominated Societies by Wesley's will, and by the General Conference itself.

(4.) "They shall not revoke or change the General Rules of the United Societies."

These examples certainly are enough to convince all that this Society is not by Wesley nor the Discipline recognized as a M. E. *Church*, or a Church of any sort.

But it gives two definitions by which any claim of the kind is quashed. (1) The definition of a Church in Art. xiii—*i. e.*, congregation of faithful men—*i. e.*, *professed believers* at least, which this Society is not, etc. (2) In determining the powers of each and every veritable *Church*, viz

"Every particular Church may ordain, change, or abolish rites and ceremonies, so that all things may be done to edification." p. 28.

I am willing to rest the settlement of this question upon this definition alone. If this Society—for, if Wesley and the General Conference, and the Discipline call it a Society, I certainly may and *should*—is indeed a Church, the Discipline—not the Word of God—declares it has the power to ordain, to change, or abolish rites and ceremonies, according to its ideas of propriety and edification. I now put these plain and pointed questions to Elder Ditzler, and demand that he answer them when he rises, as he is in duty bound to do. Has the M. E. Society in Carrollton, Mo., the power in and of itself to ordain a new rite, as feet washing or anointing the sick, for the M. E. Church, South? Has it the power to change any existing rite now enjoined by the Discipline? Has it the power in and of itself—to *abolish* the rites enjoined by the last Discipline? Elder Ditzler will not notice these, but there is not a Methodist in this house, member or minister but knows that this local Society at Carrollton, nor all the Methodist Societies in *this* State can ordain a new rite or change or abolish an old one. Therefore according to the Discipline and General Conference, this Society *here* is not a Church in any proper sense of the word.

Nor is a Quarterly Conference a Church, according to the Discipline for not a layman—an unofficial member of this So-

ciety nor of any similar one in the South can belong to the Quarterly Conference. I read from page 50.

Ques. 1. "Who shall compose Quarterly Conferences?"

Ans. "All the traveling and local preachers, * * * exhorters, stewards, trustees, and class-leaders of the respective circuits, stations, missions, together with the superintendents of Sunday schools who are members of the Church, and secretaries of Church Conferences, and none others."

And all Methodists know that a Quarterly Conference cannot ordain, change or abolish a rite or a ceremony, nor even administer a rite. It is no more nor less than a Magistrate's Court, over which the Presiding Elder presides, "to hear complaints and to receive and try appeals." Dis. p. 53.

Nor is an Annual Conference a Church in any sense of the term, though in these bodies, all traveling preachers and all supernumeraries and superannuated ministers have their membership, and in no other body in the domains of Methodism! No definition that Elder Ditzler has hitherto given of a Church of Christ applies to this body in which *he holds his membership*, no *infant* or child or *woman*, or lay member, nor even a class-leader, steward or *local preacher* ever was or can be a member until the General Rules are changed. It is a body of ministers only. In this body are no "Sacraments" or Ritual, neither baptism nor the Lord's Supper, nor is this body authorized to administer baptism. It is in no sense recognized as a Church, nor does Elder Ditzler claim it to be and therefore Elder Ditzler is not today a member of any Church on Earth. If he should prove his proposition he would at the same time prove that he nor any Methodist minister present is a member of a Christian Church for he is not a member of any local Society—and if he admits that the Annual Conference composed entirely of ministers is not a Church, he will again concede that he is not a member of any Christian Church on earth. I suggest to him that here is more legitimate work for him to do, than to discant upon the features or history of Baptist Churches, which matter has nothing to do with this question any more than the last. It is his "Church" not mine, that is *now* under examination.

The General Conference is not a church in any sense, nor

does it claim or call itself a church, nor does the Discipline recognize or speak of it as a church—but as the General Conference of the M. E. Church. It has no sacraments or ritual—no infants, no children, no women, can be members of it. Now, if the local society here is not a Scriptural church, nor the Quarterly, Annual, nor General Conference, where pray is the Scriptural *Church*? Will all these put together, if they could be—but they cannot be united *so* that a member of *one* is thereby a member of all—constitute a church? Will four negatives make an affirmative? I have shown by Wesley and the *Discipline*, and by the decision of the General Conference, that the society in this place, or any other place, or all of them in the South put together is not a Gospel, or Scriptural Church; and I have shown that if Eld. Ditzler can prove his proposition, he will prove that he is not a member of any Christian Church on earth, for he is not a member of any local society like this!

My next argument is:

II. THE M. E. SOCIETY HERE, AND ELSEWHERE, IN ALL ITS FORMS AND FEATURES, IS ONLY A HUMAN SOCIETY, SINCE IT WAS INVENTED AND SET ON FOOT BY MERE MEN, AND UNREGENERATE MEN AT THAT.

One of the first essential Scriptural characteristics of the visible Church and Kingdom of Christ is, that it is of God—from heaven, of Divine origin, and hence called Kingdom of God, and of Heaven, Church of God, of Christ, etc.

It was not originated by sinful man, or men, Prophet nor Apostle, but by Jesus Christ, the God of Heaven and King of his own Kingdom—and not *mediately*—by and through *others*, but “without hands,” by his own present, *personal* agency.

It was foretold that Christ himself should set it up.

“And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, *but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms*, and it shall stand forever. Forasmuch as thou sawest that the stone was cut out of the mountain without hands, and that it brake in pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold; the great God hath made known to the king what shall come to pass hereafter; and the dream is certain, and the interpretation thereof sure.” Dan. ii. 44, 45.

The *stone* is admitted by all sound commentators, to symbolize the visible Kingdom or Church of Christ which he was to set up at his advent. It was not before Daniel's day, the four universal earthly kingdoms, Babylonian, Persian, Grecian and Roman, had to rise and become universal before the Stone was cut out—*i. e.*, before the Kingdom of Christ should be set up. The Jewish nation, nor any conceivable organization then existing for that had previously existed, was the Church and Kingdom of Christ—mark the prophecy. The Kingdom was to be set up by the God of Heaven himself. The "Stone" which symbolized it was "cut out *without hands*," *agencies*, angelic or human. Now, I open the New Testament at an age after these four kingdoms have arisen and become universal in the days of the King of the fourth and last Empire; and I read the declaration of Jesus Christ.

"And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Matt. xvi. 18.

The Rock was himself whom Peter had confessed, and Christ declares that *he himself would upbuild his own church*. He did not commission his Apostles to do it—it would have been the sin of rebellion in them, or in angels to have done so. This is the immovable kingdom that we, the saints of Christ *have* received.

"Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved." Heb. xii. 28.

Paul expressly declares that Christ nor Peter ever claimed that they built or set up the church, but himself did so.

"For this *man* was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch as he who hath builded the house hath more honor than the house. For every house is builded by some *man*; but he that built all things *is* God. And Moses verily *was* faithful in all his house as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after; But Christ as a son over his own house; whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end." Heb. iii. 3-6.

Christ himself, then, while on earth, builded his own house—the literal and true house of God, of which the house in which Moses served was the type—nor can there be any doubt what house is here referred to, since the Apostle tells us

“whose house are we.” Paul explained it to Timothy

“These things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly: But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.” 1. Tim. iii. 14, 15.

It was a body that had officers and ordinances and definite laws, by which to govern it—and therefore *visible*.

I affirm, then, in view of these facts, that any organization confessedly invented, originated and set up by *men*, cannot be considered or recognized as a church of Christ, it not being from heaven, but of men, of the earth earthy.

I submit a question to my opponent, and to all who hear me this day—

Suppose I should originate a new religious society—originating for it a new and unheard of polity—which I do not even claim to have derived from the Bible and a peculiar membership of my own choosing, and unlike that the world had ever seen or heard of before, and sacraments—but you may be assured I would make the ordinances, sacraments peculiarly my own:—for instance, I would have all unite with my church—and I would invite *all* to receive baptism by *drinking* a glass of water, while I would repeat the design—“whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him, it shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life,” and I would teach that my baptism not only was “the means of grace”—not only conferring, but *securing* salvation to all—and honestly before God and you all, I do believe that this is as Scriptural as sprinkling or pouring. I say, suppose I should originate such church, and should succeed in gathering multitudes to follow me as I would—would you say that it was a Church of Christ—or Graves’ Church, a man’s affair, set up in opposition to Christ’s Church and Kingdom? I well know what you would call it—and you would name it rightly—nor would the mere accidents of *numbers*, *wealth* and *age* make it less Graves’ Church and more the Church of Christ—a Gospel, Evangelical, Scriptural Church. Let honest Christian men decide these questions, and then decide if I have not as good authority to originate a Christian Church as had Calvin or Luther, as John Wesley or Alexander Campbell. If my re-

ligious society would be rightly called and treated as a man's church—a mere human society, in opposition to the church which Christ set up, then I say, and you are compelled to say, that John Wesley's Society, called Methodism, is a human society set up, and to-day operating against the church which Christ established. I affirm that the M. E. Society in this city, and in every other place on earth, is a human society, and no more a Church of Christ than the Masonic or Odd Fellows' Lodge, or the Temperance Society of this place is a Christian Church.

1. *It was originated by two men*, I read from the Discipline, and thus gave you the declaration not only of John Wesley himself, but of every General Conference from the year 1784.

"2. The District Conference shall be composed of all the preachers in the District, traveling and local, including superannuated preachers (whether resident without or within the limits of the Annual Conferences to which they belong), and of laymen, the number of whom, and their mode of appointment, each Annual Conference may determine for itself." —Meth. Dis. p. 50, Art. 2.

Then two young men, John and Chas. Wesley, originated Methodism and raised up the people called Methodists, who are followers of these men, as certainly as Campbellites are the followers of A. Campbell, or the Mormons of Jo. Smith and B. Young. But these men were unregenerate sinners when they originated the first Methodist society—and can a clean thing come out of an unclean? Did God reject the work of His own son, and raise up and commission two unregenerate men to build a church for him?

In 1735, ten years after his first ordination and six years after he and Charles had started Methodism they both sailed for Georgia to convert the Indians.

"On his return, and afterwards falling in with Peter Bohler, a pious Moravian, he became convinced that he was unregenerate. "This, then, I have learned in the ends of the earth—that I am fallen short of the glory of God; that my whole heart is altogether corrupt and abominable. I am a child of wrath, and an heir of hell. I left my native country in order to teach the Georgian Indians the nature of Christianity; but what have I learned myself in the mean time? Why, (what I the least of all suspected,) that I, who went to America to convert others, *was never myself converted to God.*" This was written January 29, 1738. He became a penitent enquirer,

and in May following, (Wednesday 24th,) obtained satisfactory evidence to himself of having passed from death unto life.—See Wesley's Journal vol. iii. p. 42.

His brother Charles professed a change of heart May 3, 1738

From his history we learn that John Wesley had been preaching thirteen years before he was a converted man himself! Thus while in an unregenerate state, a wicked sinner before God, and nine years before he was a converted man, he and his brother Charles, also a sinner like himself, devised and set on foot the Methodist Society! It would be wrong for Christians to follow or obey in religion the brightest or purest angel—Christ never authorized an angel to devise a church for his children, much less men, and how infinitely much less unconverted men.

I will now submit extracts from the standard authors of the M. E. Church to show that the Methodist "church" did originate with men.

ISAAC TAYLOR, in his work, "Wesley and Methodism," page 199, says :

"Wesleyanism is a *scheme*—it is the product of *uninspired intelligence*, and therefore has its defects."

2. Page 214. "But Wesleyanism is the *work of man* it is open to the freest scrutiny—

3. "Dr. Coke arrived in New York on the 3d of Nov. 1784, and on the 25th of Dec. following, the General Conference assembled at Baltimore, *at which time the Methodist E. Church was organized.*"—Dr. Bangs' Orig. Church p. 26.

4. "Methodism has, from the beginning, been in a most striking manner, the *child of Providence*. Nearly all its peculiar characteristics were adopted, without any *previous design on the part of the instruments by whose agency it was brought into organized existence*, as circumstances seemed to require, and without expectation of their becoming elements in a permanent ecclesiastical constitution."—Dr. Hinkle, in *Platform of Methodism*.

This only claims that the Methodist E. Church came into existence by *sheer accident*. An accidental church. The Christian Church was organized by Jesus Christ—Methodism by *accident*—mere happen-so.

METHODISM, by J. H. Inskip, a work widely indorsed by the Methodist press.

5. "As a *creature of Providence*, Methodism, in her peculiar external organization, has adapted herself to the exigencies of the times, * * and hence though *constantly changing*, yet, like the modifications through which the human system passes, in the various stages of its development, she has always maintained her identity entire."—*Introduction*.

"It is but a little more than one hundred years since the first Methodist society was formed by Mr. Wesley in England. The M. E. Church *has not been in existence seventy years.*"—Page 53.

Finally, it may be said, Methodism in England and America was a *special system*. It originated in as dark and unpropitious a period almost as ever known in the history of Protestant Christianity.

6. Says Inskip, "a more wise or better arranged system of religious or moral enterprise, could not have been conceived. Of course, like *all other HUMAN INSTITUTIONS IT HAS ITS DEFECTS AND IMPERFECTIONS*."—Page 65.

7. Hear Isaac Taylor: "No man was more devoutly observant of the authority of Holy Scripture than Wesley; but his understanding was as practical in its tendencies as his piety was sincere. He *perfectly felt*, whether or not he defined that conviction in words, that an apostolic Church—although right to a pin—*which did not subserve its main purpose—the spread of the Gospel and the conversion of the ungodly must be regarded as an ABSURDITY, and a hindrance to truth*. What is the chaff to the wheat? "What are wholesome and scriptural usages and orders, which leave Christianity to die away within an *inclosure*?"

8. "I say here the fact is clearly intimated, that Wesley regarded the apostolic Church organization as *inefficient* and useless, and consequently rejected it as "*an absurdity, and a hindrance to the truth* leaving Christianity to die away. What an epitaph for frail man to write upon the work of Christ and his Apostles!! He then mapped out of his own brain a religious scheme—Church system—to supersede it, to accomplish what that could not—thus assuming more than Christly prerogatives, since he rejected the authority and work of Christ, and set up a human organization to be the *rival* and *antagonist* of Christ's Church! Methodism, then, seems to have been originated a rival of, and designed to supplant the apostolic pattern of Church organization, and its workings from its birth until the present, are all directly and palpably to this end! How then can a follower of Christ encourage it, or enlist under its rival banners? Are not such the followers of men? Even Methodists so regard themselves—the followers of John Wesley! Methodist Societies are called by Methodist writers, very properly, "Mr. Wesley's Societies," and "Methodist Societies," not Churches of Christ.

9. "He would not have turned any of the nobility away if they had sought admission into *his classes*."—*Inskip*.

10. "The fact, that few of the higher classes joined *Mr. Wesley's societies*, etc."—*Inskip*.

11. "The policy of John Wesley, and *his fellow-laborers and sons* in the gospel."—*Inskip*.

12. "You are the elder brother of the American Methodists; *I am, under God, the father of the whole family*."—*John Wesley, in a letter to Asbury*.

Here Wesley claims a divine right to create and rule Methodists, *under God; i. e. jure divino*.

13. "Our design is to show, that is our duty as ministers of Christ, and *THE SUCCESSORS* of the apostles and of John Wesley." etc.—*Inskip*.

Methodist ministers are the successors of the *apostles and John Wesley!*

Hence Methodists are very properly denominated, by their writers, "*the followers of Mr. Wesley.*"

14. "The whole body of Methodists knowing this, and acknowledging Mr. Wesley as their spiritual *father and founder*, would receive from him what they could not with *any justice or propriety* from any one else."—*Dr. Baugs' Orig. Ch.* p. 99.

15. "As Mr. Wesley, under God, was the *founder* of the Methodist Societies, and the expounder of Methodist theology, *so was he the originator* of much that is peculiar to the ecclesiastical polity of all the different branches of the great Methodist body in all parts of the world."—*Gore's His. Meth.* p. 217, the latest Methodist historian.

16. "The archetype of Methodism is the character of *its founder*. He [Wesley] was a man of but one aim, and to this every thought and effort converged." "How blessed is Methodism, to have originated (humanly speaking) FROM SUCH AN AUTHOR. She never need to fear for her safety or prosperity, while she wears the mantle of such a *prophet*."—*Memphis Methodist Advocate*

I would say, How *more blessed* to have originated with Jesus Christ, and how much less to fear did she wear the mantle of such a prophet!!

In view of the mass of authority I have produced, showing that Methodism is of man—a worldly scheme—a human expedient—a man-devised society—am I not warranted in saying without laying myself open to the charge of illiberality or bigotry that for the organization of Methodism as a scriptural church I have no more *Christian* fellowship or regard than for that of Masonry or Odd Fellowship?

Replication.

Having indicated the questions involved in the discussion of this question, which will govern me throughout, I will but briefly notice the manner in which Elder Ditzler has treated it. 1. He ridicules the very discussion of this question, thinks it absurd to question the scriptural character of the M. E. Societies, and reproaches Baptists for so doing! It is some months too late to do this. Why did not he—why did not the committee he controlled object to it? They raised no objection. It was accepted for serious discussion. Why then does not Elder Ditzler discuss it as a Christian man and scholar should? define a visible church by giving its *true*

diferentia, characteristics, and then show that the M. E. Society in this place possesses them. But what has he done the past hour? I say it with profound mortification and regret, because I did want to discuss the question as it should be, for the sake of the reputation of this debate, and for the good I hoped the discussion would do. He has rebashed his confused and confounded definition of the universal and invisible church in Heaven and on this earth! It is known to all that this invisible church is purely an ideal body. It is nothing real, but imaginary. It never was conceived of, nor can be as "set up," or "builded," or "established," or "re-established." I say it is a pure ideal conception, and never was conceived of as having organization, laws, ordinances or ritual, and of course it is a something, even if the conception is warranted by a solitary passage in the Word of God, with which we have nothing whatever to do, in discussing the plain question, whether the local M. E. Society here in Carrollton, composed of sprinkled infants and unregenerate persons seeking the aid of its rites to flee the wrath to come, and doubtless some truly regenerate persons. This certainly is no universal, nor invisible church, composed entirely of the saved in Heaven, nor a branch of it, and why has he spent the most of his hour talking about the invisible or ideal body of Christ? I assure you he has not quoted a passage of Scripture that applies or refers to the "invisible church," if there be one—not one. Had I time I could, by an analysis of them, prove it to your satisfaction.

Let him mention two or three of the passages that he is most certain to refer to, not the real but ideal church of Christ, which not a few call the "invisible church," and I will show him and you that they do not. The very passages he has most often quoted from the beginning of this debate, Heb. xi. and xii. and xiii., the ripest critics of this age, and his own Dr. Adam Clarke declare, must and do per necessity refer to the visible, real, present church of Christ on this earth! He convicts himself before you of the grossest ignorance of the Word of God, or of the most unwarranted attempt to becloud the minds of his hearers by palpable perversions of it. This

is my reply to more than one half of his speech—it was a mass of crudities and contradictions, wholly irrelevant to this question, and designed to draw me from it.

2. The rest of his essay that referred to a church on earth, was at best incoherent, and his theory intangible by any appliances possessed by me. He will of course develop them fully, even if he puts it off to the last half hour allotted to him on this question. A few independent assertions I will now notice.

1. "Now, baptism does not initiate into, or make the parties members of, such local congregation."

In the discussion of the last proposition, I showed you by presenting the authorities, that all churches in all ages, and all commentators in ages past or present, consent that the New Testament does teach that baptism does initiate into the local visible church, and I showed you by reading his own discipline that it so teaches, and every time Eld. Ditzler has sprinkled an infant or adult he has taught it and prayed it, and now he stands up here and openly denies it! I shall not repeat them, but will read you two or three statements which Eld. Ditzler has read and prayed a hundred times

"Grant to *this child* that which by nature *he* cannot have: that *he* may be baptized with water and the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ's Holy Church and be made *a lively member* of the same."

"Almighty and everlasting God, we beseech thee for thine infinite mercies, that thou wilt look upon *this child*: wash *him* and sanctify *him* with the Holy Ghost; that *he*, being delivered from thy wrath, may be received into the ark of Christ's Church."

"Then the minister, addressing the parents, or others presenting the child, shall say, In causing *this child* to be brought by baptism into the Church of Christ."

So of the office for the baptism of adults.

He presents apparent difficulties against baptism initiating in the church, but not an insuperable one—an impossibility. It is an axiom in logic that difficulties do not suffice to refute a proposition, unless they are insuperable. Now the difficulties presented by Eld. Ditzler inhere in the inauguration of all visible institutions, Masonry, Odd Fellowship, Granges—and thinking men will readily solve them by principles familiar to them.

I do most cheerfully endorse it as a rule that the baptized belong to the same organization with the officer baptizing until that relation is changed by subsequent action. Paul was baptized into fellowship with the church at Damascus and the Eunuch and the Samaritans into that of Jerusalem until he was united to some other church and they were constituted into a church at Samaria. His views of church polity are in their nebulous state, when they assume "a local habitation and a form," I will examine them. The rest of his speech was directed to the relative growth in numbers of the two bodies, as though rapidity in multiplying societies here and there, gathering numbers was an argument to prove that the M. E. society here in Carrollton possess the scriptural characteristics of a church of Christ! There the Papists, Mormons, and Spiritualists have the argument! Eld. Ditzler should have left such claptrap to his presiding Elders—his people certainly expected something better of him. He tells us to look at the fruits of Methodism and to know it, and he boasts that owing to its inherent purity and preeminent holiness, it purified the nations and even renovated all other churches and prepared them for prosperity. Well, Methodism was never purer nor the membership more holy than in Wesley's day, and no man knew better than Wesley how holy they were, and as a befitting reply to Eld. Ditzler's boast and bombast, I will read from Mr. Wesley's Journal, vol. v p. 213:

"The world say, 'The Methodists are no better than other people.' This is not true. But it is nearer the truth than we are willing to believe.

N. B. For (1.) Personal religion either toward God or man is amazingly superficial among us.

I can but touch on a few generals. How little faith is there among us! How little communion with God. How little living in heaven, walking in eternity, deadness to every creature! How much love of the world; desire of pleasure, of ease, of getting money! How little brotherly love! What continual judging one another! What gossiping, evil speaking, tale bearing! What want of moral honesty! To instance only in one or two particulars: who does as he would be done by, in buying and selling, particularly in selling horses! Write him a knave that does not. And the Methodist knave is the worst of all knaves.

(2.) Family religion is shamefully wanting, and almost in every branch."

"Our religion is not deep, universal, uniform; but *superficial, partial, uneven.*"

"But as great as this labor of private instruction is, it is absolutely necessary. For, after all our preaching, many of our people are almost as ignorant as if they had never heard the gospel. I speak as plain as I can, yet I frequently meet with those who have been my hearers many years, who know not *whether Christ be God or man. And how few are there that know the nature of repentance, faith, and holiness!* Most of them have a sort of confidence that God will save them, while the world has their hearts."—Wesley's Journal, Vol. v. pp. 213-4.

If Eld. Ditzler sees fit to continue in this line of argument, I may be tempted to read more from Mr. Wesley, and something in defense of my people, but I will still make an honest effort to influence him to *discuss this* question by urging serious and fatal objections to the claims of his Society being a Scriptural Church.—[*Time out.*

DR. DITZLER'S SECOND SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS :—As to our proposition, the wording of it was by the Baptists themselves, and if it be awkward as it ought not to be, they are to blame. The main points we can discuss any way—are we a part of Christ's Church? for that is the way we are discussing it.

He complains of me leading so much. Well, we hope he'll not get so entangled in the brush as to entirely loose our track.

He don't consider us an "evangelical body—we are in error—but a child of his father's family," etc. Very well. If he has no errors, if he is infallible, we hope he will give us light.

He then comes to his first objection to us—his first reason for not considering us a church—a branch of the church of Christ. We "are a *human* society—organized by two men—unregenerated men. It did not originate with Jesus Christ; was organized 1729 by two young men." Now let us look into these statements.

1. He misses the date by ten years; it was 1739. Wesley was converted, on his way from Georgia, a colony then of England, and not till from that date did the work begin.

2. He confounds the prayer-meetings the two or three Oxford youths had, as school boys, seeking for regeneration with the after organizations that were built up after the complete regeneration of these and other men.

Such blunders are a disgrace to the man that makes them. Cannot he get some point in history correct? Does he have to blunder on every point, get right on none? We see two of his objections are from his own want of information and they are swept away at a stroke. But two more remain.

The societies were organized by two men, hence not by Jesus Christ! Will he tell us, show us *where Jesus Christ ever* organized congregations, societies, or any thing of the kind? Is it anywhere recorded? He knows it is not. Now was

there ever a Baptist church on earth that was not organized *by men*? Can you find one? Why now all this ado and abuse, when he knows that all congregations and associations of men have to be organized *by men*? They may act under the laws of God as Wesley did, as all Baptists claim they did, but they were *men* still. Did Baptists wait for beings *not men*, to come and organize their churches?

But does Dr. Graves not know that when men are regenerated, made children of God, adopted into his family, *then*, pursuant to the teachings of the Bible they can organize themselves together, and that no church on earth was ever organized in any other way? Let him find one exception. Does Christ descend to earth to organize congregations or visible churches?

But Wesley sinned horribly in that he believed *Providence* had thrust them out to reform society! He makes a fearful parade over that! Well, is not that rich? Was not the first Baptist church in America named Providence, because they believed that Providence had even directed their stormy way to that place of security? The Brother is so blinded by prejudice he forgets and rushes right on to the breakers and into the quicksand.

Again he returns to human society. As we proved our entire proposition in our first speech, we can dwell on his objections now, and press him to the wall on every point.

You believe Baptist "societies" are churches of Jesus Christ, I presume. Well, then, we will take them up.

1. All Baptist standards hold as we do, that of God's children, any number of such may organize themselves together under God's Word, and are a church. Prof. Ripley, one of the most distinguished Baptists and writers of their church in America, says :

Those communities of Christians who have abandoned the primitive practice in respect to baptism, *are churches* not in a state of order, so far as the positive ordinances of the Gospel are concerned." *Review of Gospel & Baptist Library*, vol. iii. 214.

He admits they are *churches*.

2. BUNYAN. "The whole Church. This word comprehendeth all the parts of it, *even from Adam* to the very world's end, whether in heaven or earth, etc. Now, that baptism makes a man a member of this church I do not yet believe, nor can you show me why I should."—879.

This is exactly our position all through this debate. Thus we have these Baptists all with us—against Dr. Graves.

3. ROGER WILLIAMS.—“Backus’ History, Bap. Lib. i. 102, announced and acted on these principles as we will soon see.

BENEDICT—p. 450.

“Any company of Christians may commence a church in gospel order, by their own mutual agreement, without any reference to any other body; and this church has all power to appoint any one of their number, whether minister or layman, to commence anew the administration of gospel institutions.”

Mell of Georgia held the same. Helwys, *the* founder of the Calvinistic wing of Dr. Graves’ church, held the same. Hence a member of his church published a dialogue quoted lengthily by Baptist historians—Benedict, Backus, Cramp, which admits Baptism had been *lost* to the world, and he argues how it was to be restored—clearly setting forth how Smyth, as well as showing on what ground Roger Williams and Clark acted in later years—1639, 1644. See Cramp p. 296. He asks how baptism shall be restored after Antichrist is exalted and rules. The answer is thus given :

“We and others affirm, that any disciple of Christ, in what part of the world soever, coming to the Lord’s way, he by the word and Spirit of God preaching that way unto others and converting—he may and ought also to baptize them.”

He illustrates it by Ezra i. 3, 5, that as every Israelite was to go and build the temple—

“So now, every *spiritual* Israelite *with whom the Lord is*, and whose spirit *the Lord stirreth up*, are [is] commanded to go and build, etc., to couple them together a spiritual house unto God, upon the confession of their faith by baptism, as the Scriptures of the New Testament everywhere teach.”*

The Brownists, whom Smyth joined, repudiated the ordinations of the English church, “but they did not rebaptize.” Cramp, p. 286. How Smyth was baptized :

“There has been much dispute * * It is a thing of small consequence. Baptists *do not believe* in apostolic succession, as it is commonly taught. But the probability is, that one of the brethren baptized Mr. Smyth, and that he then baptized the others. The number of these brethren soon increased greatly. A church was formed of which Mr. Smyth was chosen pastor. At his death, 1611, Mr. Thos. Helwys was appointed in his place’—(Cramp 287)—[and *his* member *wrote* the above dialogue sustaining that right.]

*Theology, p. 150, 151.

Thus we see that all Baptists, all their founders, acted on our principles, held them to be the only scriptural views. Why has Dr. Graves abandoned all primitive Baptist principles, and gone into so many "new fangled" notions? Those principles will stand forever, because everywhere taught in the Bible as we showed in our opening, as well as former speeches.

2. Let us now show you that all Baptist churches were organized by *human* beings, on these principles.

"For the origin of this church, we must go back to 1644, when, according to tradition, it was formed. The constituents were Dr. John Clark and wife, Mark Luker, Nathaniel West and wife, William Vaughan, Thomas Clark, Joseph Clark, John Peckham, John Thorndon, William and Samuel Weeden.—Benedict, p. 465.

Benedict, 467—second clause :

"This church originated in 1656, when twenty-one persons broke off from the first church, and formed themselves into a separate body. Their names were William Vaughan, Thomas Baker, James Clark, Jeremiah Clark, Daniel Wightman, John Odlin, Jeremiah Weeden, Joseph Card, John Greenman, Henry Clark, Peleg Peckham, James Barker, Stephen Hookey, Timothy Peckham, Joseph Weeden, John Rhodes, James Brown, John Hammet, William Rhodes, Daniel Sabear, and William Greenman.

There were doubtless females in this secession but no names are given. These seceders objected against the old body,

1. *Her use of psalmody.*
2. *Undue restraints upon the liberty of prophesying, as they termed it.*
3. *Particular redemption.*
4. *Her holding the laying-on-of-hands as a matter of indifference.*

Backus, Cramp, and the historians all confirm this fact. Now what becomes of Dr. Graves' views and assaults?

But he says if God raised up Wesley it was a reproach to the men he had already raised up. Well, that is rich indeed. What does he mean? Has he been rubbing up against Ewing again? When God raised up the seventy it was a reproach to the twelve Apostles then, and all is reproach to John the Baptist. When he raised up Paul it was a reproach to Peter and the twelve, by Dr. Graves' logic. When he raised up Calvin, Beza, Melancthon, it was a reproach to Luther, etc. Did not Elijah, Isaiah, Amos succeed others? Do you not see how weak, absurd—how inexpressibly flimsy are all the positions of Dr. Graves? Why is it so? Not for

want of mental vigor, but purely because he's wrong, and we right, and such absolutely ridiculous objections are the best that can be brought against God's holy truth.

But he tells us Wesley never organized—never intended to organize a church.

1. Were that so, it does not in the least affect the merits of our position. Asbury, Coke, or any of the converted men—God's children—could do it as legitimately as Wesley, and it would be Scriptural in the light of all Baptist precedent and early teaching and sustained still by all leading Baptists of Virginia, New York, and New England. Better than this, it is sustained by the whole Bible, as we showed. Nor has Dr. Graves dared to attack a single argument we made.

2. Wesley did draw up the rules, articles of faith, ritual, and ordained Coke bishop, and empower him to do so in America. I have the first Discipline ever published, and the word "bishop" is there and an Episcopal form—mild, restricted, established, more completely in accordance with Scripture than any in existence. Our ideas of a Bishop, as to order, are essentially those of Presbyterians, as Watson and Wesley show; Wesley said he himself was a Scriptural *Episkopos*—bishop.

When Wesley wrote that hasty letter the Doctor read from, he had been misinformed as to facts. A disappointed man returned and so misstated, and colored matters as to greatly irritate the usually placid mind of Wesley, and under that feeling and impulse he spoke. But afterwards he fully guided and ratified all that was done here.

Baptist writers and preachers assailed Bunyan and Smyth with the fiercest invective, and denounced them in wicked terms. Bunyan was denounced by his brother Baptists as "a liar, antichrist, devil." He tells us of the foul abuse they poured upon him. Nay, it is one of the evils of that church, that its writers rely as much, with some noble exceptions, on slander, abuse, detraction, as on perverting records, history, and distorting the meaning of their opponents. When will they learn better?

A fourth objection, if I number them rightly, is, we do not

possess a Scriptural membership. "Every stone, he said, in that building must be a living stone."

1. Peter speaks of themselves—we as lively stones are built up. He is telling how the membership of the church is expected to work—do duty. The same style of address is often applied to the church in the Mosaic period, when infants were in it.

2. Can Baptists say that every stone in their church—every member, is a regenerated child of God? You know you cannot.

3. We formerly stated that in Peter's day people were in the church, in Paul's day, Jude's day, John's day—all this we quoted—who were anything else than "lively stones"—bad men. So that if his charge were good, it falls to the ground.

4. But does Dr. Graves want to compare the piety of his people with ours? Does he want to compare their orthodoxy with ours? Does not Benedict, does not Cramp put it in evidence that nearly the whole Baptist church ran into Socinianism, Arianism, its leaders not strictly pious at all, and warring on each other, fuming and anathematizing each other,—dead, when Wesley rose up? They do, most emphatically.

5. Have the Baptists the tests, the rules by which each congregation can be kept pure and correct, like those of our church? They have not. The Discipline both of our church and M. E. Church, being exactly the same here, demands that all who, as adults, are baptized or received into our church, profess "faith in God"—renounce the world, the flesh and the devil, and go through three times as rigid tests as do the Baptists. So this objection falls to the ground most disastrously.

We have now answered every objection the gentleman has filed against the position of our existence as a church. Sadly deplorably has he failed to adduce anything that will stand a test, bear investigation. But look at the attitude in which it places Dr. Graves as a leader and theologian. Warring on other churches, denouncing them as "mere human societies." Is this the only foundation he has on which to base such levers and pries with which to overthrow our claims? He owes it to himself, his people and the world to adduce some-

thing that will make some show, at least. How can he confront the world, face his people, with such a record? It is an attempt to upset the Andes with cob-web ropes, or transport the Rocky Mountains across the plains on corn-cob rollers.

But what has he attempted in reply to our Scripture arguments? There they stand, and they will stand forever. Having given Scripture elaborately for all our positions, we then showed the noble record of having saved Protestantism. Dr. Graves' church was as dead, as lifeless and hopeless as a last year's corn-stalk. All their success, all their prosperity, they received from us. What preachers they had were either out-and-out Arians, Socinians, lifeless, useless, indifferent, or the opposite extremes, telling the people that hell was full of infants, and preaching up such a godless theology as would freeze to polar frigidity all better impulses of the human heart.

1. We have triumphantly established our principles by the Scripture, in our first speech. Dr. Graves has not even attacked any point made.

2. We have shown that under God, we saved Protestantism. He has not dared to meet or try to break the force of our historic exhibit. It is full, complete.

3. We have met every objection he produces to refute our proposition, hurling back upon his own head the consequences, the deductions he draws from the positions he assumes.

4. We showed that the Baptist church did hold the same principles as to the right of organizing a church, restoring the ordinances and purity of the church, that Wesley held, with this grand exception—he did not have to go and baptize a man, and that one in turn, baptize him, in order to restore baptism, as Smyth and Helwys and their Baptists did in England, and as Roger Williams, Holliman, John Clark, etc., had to do in America, while all the Anabaptists of Germany had their baptism directly from Rome.

He told us a great long rig ma role about being invited to some religious convention up in Virginia, where the most visionary men in the world—a set of religious hotspurs and

madcaps were going to launch a new-fangled church with a great hurrah and so on. We thought at first it was going to be something, but lo! it turned out to be a mere body of hair-brain fanatics and men of Ewing proclivities, and, he tells us, they wrote *Dr. J. R. Graves* a letter of invitation to attend—Yes, indeed they did.

Well, who is surprised at that? Not I, to be sure. I would have expected it. They undoubtedly had read his works, and if they had, they had every reason to expect him to attend. Had they heard what we have from the good Doctor, undoubtedly they would have expected his presence, and made him president of the meeting.—[*Time out.*

DR. GRAVES' SECOND REPLY.

MR. PRESIDENT:—I will continue my objections to the claims of the local M. E. Society in this place being a Scriptural Church and hold my replication to the conclusion of my speech.

My third objection is

III. THE METHODIST SOCIETY IN CARROLLTON OR ANY OTHER PLACE DOES NOT POSSESS A SCRIPTURAL MEMBERSHIP.

The legitimate members of the Church of Christ, visible, are declared by the Word of God to be "Saints," the "Faithful in Christ Jesus," believers in Christ, "the saved," "spiritual" men and women as opposed to "Carnal"—those "born from above," quickened and made alive by the Holy Spirit, "adopted," the "children of God," every one, "first-born ones," whose "names are written in the Book of Life." The Methodist Discipline defines it:

"The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered, according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.—Meth. Dis. Art. xiii, p. 17.

I like Dr. Ditzler's definition better. "No one can be a member of the true Church of God," and of course of no one of its "branches," unless he is a child of God, justified by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, it requires one to be in Christ Jesus." See page 21, Wilkes-Ditzler Debate.

He will not attempt to go back on this definition. I ask him again, as I have so often, to define a visible church, that has ordinances. He has for the past hour assumed that the church we are discussing is the invisible church. He is outraging discussion. Will he accept the thirteenth article as the definition of a Christian church?

Now, the M. E. Society here does not claim to be such a body as Elder Ditzler or as the Discipline defines it to be. It is not a body of "faithful men," nor of professed Christians even.

Perhaps not one-third, or one-tenth of its members profess to enjoy satisfactory evidences of regeneration, or of heart justification. The larger part of the adult membership are still but *nominally* desiring to "flee the wrath to come," etc., while one third or one-half of its members are *incapable of hearing or believing the Gospel!* If it was properly defined it would be :

"A society composed partly of professing Christians, partly of unregenerate persons professing a desire to become christians, and largely of morally unconscious infants and children."

A class-leader in the Mississippi Bottom told our missionary that the M. E. Church at that place consisted of one hundred and fifty members. He knew but three that professed regeneration of heart. And a M. E. preacher in one of the populous towns of Mississippi, confessed to me, while his church was by far the largest, numbering between some two and three hundred, very few were *regenerate* or professed to be—*nominally* seeking to flee the wrath to come. It is certain that the word *church*, in the New Testament, denominates no such heterogeneous and semi-secular medley of a society.

To say that the M. E. Society, at Carrollton, is a society of professing Christians, would be erroneous, for it would be ascribing to it a property it does not possess, nor even professes to have. It is *not* a society of Christians; for Christians are believers in Christ, who are recognized as such by a declaration of their faith; but a large part of this Society consists of members who are incapable of faith. Or, were they admitted to be believers, are incapable of the profession which is necessary to the cognizance of Christian discipleship.

Suppose Peto or Peabody of England, had left a bequest of one hundred thousand dollars to build a church house in this place for a Christian Church nearest answering the definition of Art. XIII.—A congregation of faithful men, understanding it in its lowest sense—professed believers in Christ, in which the ordinances were administered as they were in the apostolic churches, what congregation here would be the *least likely to get it?*

But this element of membership is not accidental, but *constitutional*. Your Discipline requires in fact none but those

seeking salvation. It nowhere makes any provision for the reception and baptism of a regenerate person. I will read the conditions only required by the statute book.

2. "Such a society is no other than *"a company of men having the form and seeking the power of godliness, united in order to pray together, to receive the word of exhortation, and to watch over one another in love, that they may help each other to work out their salvation."*—Dis. page 32.

4. There is only one condition previously required of those who desire admission into these societies, a "desire to flee from the wrath to come, and to be saved from their sins."

"The minister shall cause the candidates to be placed conveniently before the congregation, and after baptizing any who may not have been previously baptized, he shall say : etc."

"Brethren, the Church is of God, and will be preserved to the end of time, for the promotion of his worship and the due administration of his word and ordinances—the maintenance of Christian fellowship and discipline—the edification of believers, and the conversion of the world. *All, of every age and station, stand in need of the means of grace which it alone supplies ; and it invites all alike to become fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God.* But as none who have arrived at years of discretion can remain within its pale, or be admitted to its communion, without assuming its obligations, it is my duty to demand of these persons present whether they are resolved to assume the same."

"Then shall the minister address the candidates, as follows : Dearly beloved, you profess to have a desire to flee from the wrath to come and to be saved from your sins; you seek the fellowship of the people of God, to assist you in working out your salvation."—Dis. pp. 215-217.

Now this is all that can be found in the Discipline on the subject. There is not one word about *faith* in Christ as having been exercised, received and enjoined or regeneration of heart required in all this, but simply a desire to flee the wrath and a promise to repent, etc. A person may live and die as many have, a creditable *member* of a Methodist Episcopal Society, and never make a profession of regeneration. Prior to 1866 a six months trial was required of all seekers, and if they then still evinced a desire to seek, they were admitted into full membership, but The General Conference of that year took away this probationary porch and admitted all into the Societies and to baptism at once ! A movement backwards.

We see that a professedly regenerate—christian membership was an *element* essential to the existence of a Scriptural church, a congregation, a body of faithful men," say your articles,

professed *Christians*, not sinners. To call a body or society a church, not constitutionally composed of such, is to mislead and deceive those who may be in it, to misteach the world and do the grossest violence to the Word of God. The Sacred Scriptures know no such churches or branches.

Let me illustrate this by the figure of another.*

"When we learn from the Scriptures that a *synagogue* was a religious assembly of the *Jews*, and from authorized usage that the *Sanhedrim* was their Judicial Court, we know that *Jews*, exclusively, constituted these assemblies. The terms, according to their authorized usage, are exclusive of all others. Any other assembly than one of *Jews* is not a *synagogue*, or *Sanhedrim*; for these terms mean not simply an *assembly*, or a *religious* or *judicial* assembly, but a religious or judicial assembly of *Jews*. A Jewish membership is an element essential to their existence. Without the existence of *Jews* there can be no *synagogue*, or *Sanhedrim*. It is immaterial, though other assemblies may, in all other respects, be perfectly like a *synagogue*, or *Sanhedrim*; they are not like it in an element essential to its existence, and therefore to their identity. The same is true of the word *Parliament*, as signifying the British Legislature. We know that this word means the Legislative Assembly of England. We know, therefore, that none but Englishmen are eligible to its membership; that wherever it exists, it is composed of Englishmen: and that any other assembly than one of Englishmen is not the Parliament. The conclusion, respecting the sense of this word, is specially true, as it is learned from the proper source, in *English History*. The same is true of the word *church*. When we know that this word is used, in the Scriptures to designate an assembly of *Christians*, we know that no other assembly can be a church; just as well as we know that no substance can exist in the absence of its essential elements; or that there is no tree where there is not that which the word tree signifies."

I adopt the sentiments of one of our most eminent ministers and writers in North Carolina, that this audience and the world may see that I represent here the sentiments of every sound Baptist on this continent touching this vital issue between Baptists and Methodists, which so long as it exists must forever separate and alienate and provoke incessant hostility between us.

"The great and cardinal defect of Methodist Societies is their doctrine of an UNCONVERTED MEMBERSHIP. This is the vent in the foundation: the rot in the core. This vital element of Methodism is the deadly antagonist of true Christianity. It is essentially and detrimentally secular, while Christ says, "My Kingdom is not of this world." The Church of Jesus Christ consists of those who are "called to be saints, and sanctified in Christ Jesus." They "are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an

* W. H. Jordan.

holy nation, a peculiar people, that "they "should shew forth the praises of Him who hath called" them "out of darkness into His marvelous light." They are "THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD" How little does such a glorious description of the Church of Christ agree with the character of societies whose very life-blood is an unconverted membership?—the half of whose members consists of unconscious infants; and the natural and legitimate effect of whose principles is to organize a society in which true piety is no more a necessary condition of membership, than it was of admission to the privileges of the Mosaic economy? In fact, to abolish from the whole earth the sight or knowledge which, "coming" to the "Lord" "as unto a living stone," "are" "as also, lively stones-built up a spiritual house," an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ:" and to supplant its place with an institution in which not a member shall occupy his position in consequence of his voluntary, or indeed of *any* profession of his faith in Christ, or shall ever have dedicated himself to the Lord in the ordinance of baptism. This it is the very nature of Methodism to do. It is the dreaded progeny conceived in an unholy embrace with secular ambition, with which she is in travail.

A Christian Church and a Methodist Society differ, therefore, not only in the *instituted* but the *moral* condition of membership, as much as a Christian Church differs in its conditions of membership from the Mosaic dispensation. Such a difference in the condition of membership naturally imparts a corresponding difference to its *nature*. Accordingly, we see that the materials composing a Methodist Society and a Christian Church are materially and radically different. A large if not the larger part of Methodist Societies consists of *infants*. Can such a society be the same with one whose members must all be professed believers in Christ? Suppose the law of the Christian kingdom required that its subjects should consist exclusively of Jews, would a society whose members, in whole or part, were Gentiles be a Christian Church? Can again, a society be a Christian Church, in which persons who are of age are admitted to membership without even professing to be converted? Is not the practice of admitting members into a church, as a means of conversion, one of the grossest corruptions of the Gospel, and eminently calculated to abolish the distinction between the church and the world, and to convert religion into an engine of secular ambition? There can be but one answer to this question among Baptists. If such a Society be a Church, the association of Whitfield, the Wesleys, and others, at Oxford, for their religious or other improvement, was a church. Indeed, upon this principle nothing is more easy than the concoction of a Christian Church. All that is necessary, at any time or any place, is for a company of dissidents, professedly unregenerate, to separate from a communion which they acknowledge to be a true Church of Christ, and, in violation of its canons, organize independent "*societies*;" and, instead of standing branded as a SCHISMATICAL BODY, it is a full-blown, Heaven-authenticated Church of Christ! Upon such a principle Christian Churches may be easily erected and as indefinitely multiplied as were our late unfortunate Confederate

notes. We can only say, that if the Church of the "living God" be a creature thus blown into existence by mortal breath, it is a very different institution from what we have ever believed it to be. Says Dr. W. H. Jordan: If a Society be a Christian Church merely because it contains *some* believers, then a cake of mud—to say nothing *worse*—containing some flour, is the same as a wheaten loaf; and it is the same whether we eat the loaf, or, for the sake of the flour it contains, eat the mud. The truth is, the flour which assumes such a heterogeneous and vitalizing connection, becomes assimilated to its associated element, loses its value, and is worth but little if any more than the mud itself.

We must acknowledge we cannot see the consistency, and quite as little the delicacy, with which Methodist Societies complain of Baptists for not admitting their unconverted members to their communion, when they know that we would not baptize or receive them into our own churches. The reception of such persons into a church they regard as dishonorable to the Gospel, subversive of its very foundation in a spiritual membership, and of a most unpropitious and threatening aspect towards the unfortunate subjects themselves of such a flagrant malpractice. It is as inconsistent and unnatural to receive unconverted members into a Christian Church as it would be to bring to a feast a DEAD MAN: and, by their various arts, to galvanize his cold and clammy face and shrunken limbs, over the festal board, into some frightful and ghostly imitation of the acts of life. Unconverted men are "*dead in trespasses and sins*:" and until it shall please God, of His mercy, to raise them from the dead, they are unfit for the habitations of the living. They should lie in their graves, as their only fitting place, until the Eternal Spirit shall awake them to life. They will then as naturally seek union with the living as they were previously unfit for it."

Replication.

The first thing I notice in his last speech is the endeavor to *change the wording* of the question, which he cannot be allowed to do. It matters not who proposed it, Elder Ditzler accepted it through his committee. I have heard Methodist Elders and others talk about branches of the church, and assert that their Society or church itself was one of the *branches* of Christ's Church, and now I want to know what Elder Ditzler means by the phrase "a branch of the church." He wants now to say *part* of the church, and I don't know what that means. When we follow branches we ultimately come to the trunk, the parent tree. Now when I follow this Methodist branch back, I find it a branch or twig of another branch, and following that I come to the church of Rome, the mother tree. But the Catholic Apostacy was never a branch of the

Church of Christ. If Methodist societies are branches of anything, they are branches of the Papacy. The Episcopal hierarchy, in the bosom of which Methodism was originated, boasts that she is the Anglican branch—and eldest daughter of the Latin, or Roman Catholic church. There is another theory prevalent among Ritualists—i. e., that the church is indeed one, but divided into several parts or families, as the various Episcopal sects indeed are—as the Greek Episcopal, the Latin Episcopal, the English and Protestant Episcopal, and the Methodist Episcopal churches—related as children and grandchildren of the same parent, the Catholic. I will and must suppose that Elder Ditzler means that Methodism is a “part of” this church. He will not have the hardihood to claim that the local society in this city is a part or a branch of the invisible church, *that has no parts or divisions*. Will he explain?

I have never said that I considered this Society here, nor any Methodist Society, nor all of them, as Evangelical, or part of my Father’s family, nor the shadow of such an admission have I made. But that I no more admitted it to be a church than I did a Masonic Lodge in this city. It is always the best to state an opponent’s position correctly, and especially when he has the opportunity of correcting.

2. But I have disgraced myself in stating that the first rise of Methodism was in 1729, and that in that year the first Society was formed by Messrs. John and Charles Wesley, and that I confound the prayer-meetings with the organization, etc., and intimates that I blunder on every point, and get right on none, and charges it to my lack of information, etc., Now this will do for a professional controversialist, but let us see who blunders, and who perverts.

I will take it for granted that John Wesley, the father of Methodism, knew quite as well as Elder Ditzler, when he originated and started his first Society. Hear what he says:

“In 1729, two young men in England, (Charles and John Wesley, members of the church of England, and the latter a minister,) reading the Bible, saw they could not be saved without holiness, followed after it, and incited others to do so.”

“In November, 1729, at which time I came to reside in Oxford, my brother and I, and two young gentlemen more, agreed to spend three or

four evenings in a week together. On Sunday evening we read something in divinity, on other nights the Greek and Latin classics."

"On Monday, May 1st, our little society began in London, But it may be observed, the first rise of Methodism, so called, was in November, 1729, when four of us met together at Oxford."

In 1735, this society in Oxford had increased to fourteen or fifteen members.

Who correctly represents the facts in the case? Methodism then originated with four unregenerated young men, says John Wesley, who, becoming the most active, assumed, and was soon acknowledged to be the father of the system. The second rise of Methodism was in Savannah, Ga., April, 1736. Let Mr. Wesley speak, and it will save my courteous opponent from charging me with blunders. He writes from Georgia of this Society thus:

"After the evening service, as many of my *parishioners* (not Christians necessarily) as desire it meet at my house (as they do on Wednesday evening) and spend about an hour in prayer, singing and mutual exhortation."

The third and last rise, he says, "was at London, on this day, May 1st, 1737, when forty or fifty of us agreed to meet together every Wednesday evening, in order to a *free conversation*, (about what, the Greek and Latin classics?) begun and ended with singing and prayer."

"In January, 1739, our *Society* (Mr. Wesley did not presume to call it a *Church*) consisted of about sixty persons. It continued gradually increasing all the year. In April I went down to Bristol, and soon after a few persons agreed to meet weekly, with the *same intention* as those in London;"

All can see there was no originating anything new in London in 1739, any more than there was on the day of Pentecost. John Wesley says Methodism commenced in 1729. J. Ditzler says it did not, but in 1739; will Methodists decide? I will quote a few paragraphs from Mr. Inskip's work on Methodism, since Elder Ditzler has joined issue with me as to who originated Methodism. Mr. Inskip says:

"In the beginning, Mr. Wesley did not conceive the idea of forming a Society at all. Afterwards, however, *he* (not Jesus Christ, not an apostle, not an angel, but he John Wesley, priest of the church of England) consummated such an organization as he found (taught or exemplified in the New Testament? No, he did not consult that) but as he found to be suitable and necessary. But this organization was not a distinct sect, holding a particular formal creed, or prescribing any exclusive method and ceremonies of worship. It was a SOCIETY IN THE CHURCH, (i. e. of England.)"

Mr. Inskip seems to be penetrated with the conviction that his Church is but a *sham* Church. He claims for Methodism but little more than Masonry claims to be, and nothing more than the American Bible Society is—a “*system*”—not a Church, but only a system or scheme of a religious and moral enterprise! “Methodism is not a mere sectarian form of Christianity, *but a SYSTEM of religious and moral enterprise.*” Page 40. Again, he says, “A more wise or better arranged *SYSTEM of religious and moral enterprise*, could not have been conceived. Of course, *LIKE ALL OTHER HUMAN INSTITUTIONS, IT HAS ITS DEFECTS AND IMPERFECTIONS!*” Page 65: Here Mr. Inskip frankly admits that it is a *human institution*, and an *imperfect and defective* scheme. May I allow him to tell us here who devised the *System*? See page 54:

“Finally, it may be said, Methodism in England and America, was a *special system.*”

“To meet the emergency which then existed, God raised up a company of great men—men who were great in intellectual endowment, moral excellence, and inventive genius. There was John Wesley, who has justly been designated the greatest of ecclesiastical legislators—Whitfield, the most extraordinary of pulpit orators—Charles Wesley, among the best of sacred poets—Coke, the leader of modern missionaries—Asbury, the most laborious of bishops—and Clark and Benson, one the most learned, the other the best practical commentator ever known. *THESE MEN DEvised THIS POWERFUL INSTRUMENTALITY, WELL STYLED ‘CHRISTIANITY IN EARNEST.’*”

“Every agency they could command, however novel and irregular, they used with energy and enthusiasm.”

The Wesleys, Whitfield, Coke, Asbury, Clark and Benson, then *DEvised* Methodism. They did not copy it from the Bible, or mould it according to the teachings of Christ, or conform it to the model church, built by Christ, or Mr. Inskip would not say it was a “*HUMAN INSTITUTION,*” or “*DEvised*” by the above men! Will Methodist Christians think in what fold they are? whom they are following? and what institution they *are* supporting?—[*Time Out.*

I reserve the rest I have to say to my next speech.

DR. DITZLER'S THIRD SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—He tells us he asked me to define the church. It is unfortunate the Doctor is so hard of hearing. He loses a great deal by it.

As the Doctor has made no real point, we will call his attention to a few points that demand attention at his hands. As I meet and overthrow every point he seeks to make, we hope he will try to meet some of our points raised against his church. They are congregational. Each church is indifferent—a form of ecclesiasticism never known in the world till as late as A. D. 1602. We call his attention to succession, so relied on by Dr. Graves and his people in the South and West, and to the form of that government.

APOSTOLIC OR BAPTIST SUCCESSION.

1st. ITS CLAIMS OR PRETENSIONS ARE

1. Repudiated and ignored by their best historians and writers—Benedict, Backus, Ripley, Bunyan, Cramp, Jeter, etc

2. Not claimed by their most eminent divines in the present day.

3. Refuted by all history. Giesler, the most accurate historian utterly grinds to powder all such claims.

2d. It implies that Baptists cannot rest their case on Bible support—or its own merits, but needs scaffolding and fictitious support.

3d. A doctrine attended with such results as this is, should be clear, sustained by the most positive, simple, and unquestionable facts. Yet 1. It is supported not by a single fact in the Bible or history 2. Contrary to all the records of (1) general history, (2) repudiated and destroyed by all standard, candid Baptist writers.

BEING CONGREGATIONAL—WHENCE CAME IT? Let us examine into the government here.

1. From Moses to Christ the Church was not congregational,

Num. xxvii. 15-23. There was nothing of the kind, and the laws for the government of the Church were a unit. The laws for a congregation were for all, and no such thing as congregationalism was dreamed of. They had no Brown or Robinson to invent it.

2. Christ and John found it thus. Where now did John organize and officer congregations or separate churches? Show that. But you must do this to make good your claims—start right before you get into the fog of later history. Howell, p. 75, and their authors—all Baptists—contend John's was Christian baptism, and they were never rebaptized, p. 75.*

3. With Jewish precedents, Christ uses the word Church thrice—Matt. xvi. 18; xviii. 17 twice there, in the familiar Jewish sense, verses 18-20 also.

4. During Christ's personal ministry he never organized those who believed on him, or were pardoned by him, into separate congregations, any more than did John. He taught in the temple, in houses, everywhere—healed, pardoned, saved. It devolves on Dr. Graves to show where he did do these very things to make good his side of the question. Yet he knows he dare not attempt it.

5. Where in Apostolic records do we find the change? Examine the Apostolic history.

(1.) Acts i, 22-26 as a whole they select—the Holy Spirit chooses the one. Nothing congregational here. (2.) Acts 11, 4-11 all these Jews followers of Christ—some of whom doubtless are named Acts i. 15, the number assembled on that occasion “together,”—then converts 11-41 “were added”—no new organization, “continued in the temple, 46, daily.

(3.) Acts vi. 1-4—“The multitude of the disciples” were called in with “the twelve” Apostles, to look out seven proper persons “whom we may appoint.” This is not congregationalism.

(4.) Acts viii. 6, 8, 12, 14—“Now when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John.”

*Bunyan says, “John gathered no *particular* Church.” A Reason of my Practice, Complete Works, 829. See Iron Wheel also, p. 549.

The Apostles and brethren as a body assumed charge.
(5.) xi. 1-2; v. 18 and v. 22.

‘And the apostles and brethren that were in Judea heard that the Gentiles had also received the word of God.’ “And when Peter was come up to Jerusalem, they that were of the circumcision contended with him.” “saying, Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with *them*.” “But Peter rehearsed *the matter* from the beginning, and expounded *it* by order unto them saying.” “I was in the city of Joppa praying: and in a trance I saw a vision. A certain vessel descended, as it had been a great sheet, let down from heaven by four corners; and it came even unto me.”

Here we see not only no congregationalism, but just the opposite, and facts utterly contrary to, and irreconcilable with it.

(6.) xiv. 26—Paul had gone by the recommendation of the Church at Antioch, yet xv. 1-3, shows there was no congregationalism yet. The following will confirm this:

“Wherefore my sentence is, that we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles are turned to God.” “Then it pleased the apostles and elders, with the whole church, to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas: namely, Judas surnamed Barnabas, and Silas, chief men among the brethren.” “And they wrote letters by them after this manner; The apostles and elders and brethren send greeting unto the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia.” “Forasmuch as we have heard, that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying, Ye must be circumcised, and keep the law; to whom we gave no such commandment.” “It seemed good unto us, being assembled with one accord, to send chosen men unto you with our beloved Barnabas and Paul.” “Men that have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.” “We have sent therefore Judas and Silas, who shall also tell you the same things by mouth.” “For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things.” “And some days after, Paul said unto Barnabas, Let us go again and visit our brethren in every city where we have preached the word of the Lord, and see how they do.

The Apostles, etc., as a whole settle these matters—not the congregations for themselves.

(7) Acts viii. 38-39—Of what individual church did Philip make the Eunuch member who was on his way to a distant place?

(8.) xxi. 25—the same case as xv.

(9.) Did the conversion of parties Acts x. 41-47 make Cornelius, etc., members at Jerusalem? Those in xiv, were they made members at Antioch?

Now here we have a chance to test your form of Church government, yet we see it will not stand investigation for one moment.

Let us now examine the points the Doctor sought to make against us.

He calls attention to the Church in Carrollton, saying that they cannot tell (1) how many infants, nor (2) how many unconverted members, received as seekers, are not a society of believers, for a large part, he says, cannot believe.

He guesses at it all—has no information—shuts his eyes, dashes ahead, and as usual, is unhorsed, badly crippled, and tries some other point of attack.

We must inform him (1) That Bro. McDonald keeps a record of all baptisms here, as is made the duty by our laws in all churches. But (1) Whether we do right or wrong, that not being under discussion now, infants are not reported in our statistics as members. Our statistics are wholly of adults in both wings of Methodism. Hence you are misled and wrong here again. (3) As to unconverted members, Baptists will too gladly take these Methodists into their own church, requiring no additional conversion, but only a dip into water. Nay, Methodist proselytes are deemed so good by them, they take our expelled members and ministers—even in many cases where we expel them for immoral conduct. These are unpleasant things to tell, but when you here bring in a comparison, if you suffer by it, it is your own fault. But we are far from pursuing such a course—disdain to do so—where you expel for immorality.

What he has to say on infant baptism, we had that up three days, and will have it up again in our next, so we will let that pass till then, and it will fare as all else he has attempted will fare.

Now hear him again. He says we have no service to baptize regenerate people! Nay, “not a word about *faith in the heart* in the service for baptism!”

Now turn to Discipline, page 149—“Dost thou believe in God, and in Jesus Christ? Wilt thou be baptized in this faith?” These are only a few of like close questions put to

every adult when we baptize, in both the great bodies of Methodism. So again you see how reckless are the Doctor's assertions. It would mortify me beyond expression to be caught up, hemmed in, exposed as the gentleman is at every turn, in every corner, and no way open to escape.

He stalks right on into the following most unguarded, and ungenerous statement—every word of which convicts him of grossest ignorance of what we teach or of wilful misrepresentation. He tells us the vital point—the rock on which we stand—on which Methodists rest is unregenerate members in the church—half of whose membership are unconscious infants!

We know that is the way they report us, and hence pretend to a larger adult membership than we have, when we number two, or two and a half to their one of adult members. We repeat, we do not report our infant baptisms in our statistics of membership in a single case. When will Baptists try to learn just a little truth, at least?

He tells us that from the beginning they, as Baptists have protested against infant baptism. Beginning of what? The beginning of the seventeenth century, we presume, for earlier than that there never was a Baptist church on the earth. Then they began. The first Anabaptist Churches in the common sense of that term did not at first reject infant baptism, even as Giesler and others quoted clearly show

But while you, as Baptists, made a big hurrah over baptism, why did you not do more in the way of arousing religious sentiment, purity of life, soundness of doctrine? Religion was dying out everywhere under your teaching. We find you mired down in the mire and clay of doubt and uncertainty—dispirited—helpless, and going down before your victorious adversaries, and pulled you out, gave you all the start you got, keep up your membership in part today and yet you have no heart to thank us for it. He thinks it awful if by our rules men could organize churches as fast as Confederate notes. Would to God they were organized even faster than that. Then we would have the earth soon filled with hallelujahs, we would spare enough fire of love to Baptists to dry up the

water frenzy; and the whole land be redeemed. That is what we want—need.

Doctor Graves throws out a dry net and catches up all the unguarded expressions of men, condenses them together here, and then offers it to you as what our church is. Suppose we take the sayings that unguarded Baptists and open communion Baptists and all have said of the Baptist Church, and what a picture we could draw. But every candid mind knows it would be wholly unfair—unjust.

No doubt Dr. Graves often upbraids his own people just as Dr. Pierce does, and enters deep complaint, but is it fair to take that as a proof that his people are less spiritual and devoted than other churches? At the same hour, many ministers of other churches are doing the same thing—using like words of appeal to their people.

Thus you see Dr. Graves all the way through, simply relies on the merest little catch-penny arguments and deals them out as if they were well founded, well digested and legitimate, yea, serious impediments before us—reasons for not regarding us as a real Christian church. He urges and seems to take the position that if any unconverted people be in the church, it is *not* a church. He quotes—“I will keep all thy righteous judgments.” But this was David. He maintains that David was not in a church—was no church then. So his text is against him. But look at the matter now. He urges that if we have unregenerate members in the church, we are not a church. We showed—

1. That there were unregenerate members in the church in the Old Testament times.

2. Bad, unregenerate members in the church in the days of Peter, Paul and John.

3. Unregenerate members in the Baptist church—plenty of them.

4. Now if these were all Scriptural Churches, though parties were in them that were not entitled to a place therein, why does it happen the rule cannot hold as true in our case as in the times of Moses, of John, of Peter, of Paul, of Dr. Graves?

5. Were we to grant therefore, that the infants—yea, “unconscious infants” were not legitimate members, how can parties that at least are not guilty of wrong—who cannot disgrace the church by shameful acts of wickedness—parties of whom the Master said “Of such is the kingdom of heaven”—“he that receiveth one such little child in my name, receiveth me”—suppose, we repeat, all this be wrong—without warrant, do they neutralize the validity of church existence when the tens of thousands of adult sinners and hypocrites in your church to-day are not admitted to forfeit your claim to being recognized as a legitimate, a Scriptural Church?

We have stated and restated the true philosophy of church existence till we are tired repeating it. All those in a saved relation to God—all his saved ones—who, were they to die, would be received to himself, constitute his real church. All who are by his blood redeemed to himself—saved. Any number of these may assemble together, worship, administer the ordinances, and they are a legitimate church. They constitute a visible church—a local congregation representing a part of God’s great spiritual family or church. All the facts in this position were laid before you on Proposition Second on Infant Baptism. We represented a brief summary of them in our first speech on this proposition. Never, no, not once has our Brother seen proper to attack a single position we took. They all stand boldly out, unscathed, unshaken. As long as they stand, our position is true, and all this “nibbling around the edge” as my friend Dr. Brents would say, amounts to absolutely nothing.—[*Time out.*

DR. GRAVES' THIRD REPLY.

MR. PRESIDENT:—That I do not misrepresent the only condition of membership since the change in 1866, I present a few extracts taken from a series of articles published in the *Methodist Advocate*, at Nashville, Tenn., March 28th, 1874, by the oldest living Methodist on this Continent, Lovick Pierce, of Georgia, the father of Bishop Pierce. I do it for triple reasons. Eld. Pierce offered the bill in Conference that secured that change, *i. e.*, abolished the Probationary system and thus took the seekers into the church, and if any man, he ought to know if justifying faith, or being “renewed in the spirit of his mind,” is the present condition of membership. I do it because I want to perpetuate his protest and his prophecy, and place them before the eyes of thousands who otherwise will never see them.

He wrote his articles before going to the last Conference to which he went, with the hope of securing the change that would chrystallize his views into church laws and thus secure a Scriptural membership to the Methodist Church South, evermore. But I regret to say he failed—he made the effort and FAILED.

I quote from one of a series of articles in the *Methodist Christian Advocate*, Nashville, and I do not strain or pervert his meaning—

“I am prompted just now to urge this inquiry, because I find in our papers frequent allusions to it in terms which incline me to believe we have some among us who are trying to make others believe that to require any other religious experience as a condition precedent to reception into full connection as a member of the Church, than Mr. Wesley required to admit persons into his Societies—which was only admitting them into a class-prayer-meeting to aid them in seeking salvation—would be to innovate wantonly upon Wesleyan Methodism. Why, Mr. Editor, am I mistaken, or did I not see in your excellent *Advocate* very lately, mixed up along with many excellent things, as difficulties in the way of a genial Methodist fellowship between us and the Methodist Episcopal Church, this, as the most *unbearable* and *irreconcilable* of all, that they had departed

so far from our Methodism here, as to make justification by faith—that is, the simple profession of it—a necessary condition in their law of religious eligibility to membership. On this, as a matter of fact, I am not posted, but do earnestly hope it is true. My hope of a general fraternization is very feeble, but in as far as I am concerned I want the brethren to know that it will not be because they have put up the condition previously required for actual membership in the church to the point where, I believe the examples in the New Testament put it in the inauguration of the Christian Church.”

This is a frank confession that he regards the present condition of membership in the Society here at Carrollton as unscriptural, which sustains my point. But that there may be no doubt, I read two more:

“And now, Brother Editor, as I am launching my Methodistic rectitude upon your judgment, I ask if this mentioned fact is not proof enough to sustain my chief postulate, which is, that the future accord of Methodism with its original mission, to spread holiness over these lands, will depend mainly upon whether we, as builders, see that this spiritual house is carried on to its final complement *only with lively stones*. As I must hasten on my way, let me say—not as a prophet, technically considered, but nevertheless as a seer—that the church will never hereafter be saved from fashionable dissipations by the enforcement of a strong moral discipline. This muscle in our arm is permanently paralyzed by the unconscious effect of political liberty upon safe moral restraint. Mind what I say, the church must be *kept pure by building only with members renewed in the spirit of their minds*.”

“It is now not only a question, but *the* question, whether, as true Methodists, we are to admit members into the Methodist Episcopal Church (I use this denominational title now in its original sense) on Mr. Wesley’s one only condition previously required of such as desired to join his Societies, or, as a church, are we bound to put our condition for church membership higher, inasmuch as church membership is a much higher state of communion and fellowship, than the joining of a religious society, to *aid the members of the Society to flee from the wrath to come by seeking present salvation from sin?*

Our future members must come in not so much on Mr. Wesley’s one only condition previously required, but upon King David’s inspired platform: Here I am myself, even poor me—“Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path. I have sworn and I will perform it, that I will keep all thy righteous judgments. Amen.”

If this could only be accomplished it would be the grandest and most salutary religious revolution that has taken place on this continent since its discovery, and if one or twenty more great J. Wesleys will only aid in bringing it about I will write them. I hope this very Debate will aid in doing it, and I believe it will.

IV THE M. E. SOCIETY IN THIS PLACE, AS IN EVERY OTHER,
LACKS AN ESSENTIAL QUALIFICATION OF A SCRIPTURAL CHURCH.
IT IS WITHOUT SCRIPTURAL BAPTISM.

Scriptural baptism is a constitutional prerequisite to the existence of a Church of Christ. There can be no church in any true sense of the term, without it. The voice of every standard writer in every denomination under the sun is in perfect accord in this. "NO SCRIPTURAL BAPTISM, NO CHURCH."

When I say baptism, I mean just what the founder of his church, and the giver of the rite meant, i. e., the act he himself received at the hands of his Harbinger *in the river Jordan*. There lives not a man, unless biased by prejudices, or influenced by party, but that in his conscience believes that Christ commanded His apostles to perform the identical act for baptism, which He and they had received from John the Baptist in the Jordan, and in his innermost conviction he believes that act was a burial, an immersion, a planting in the likeness of death, and a rising again in the likeness of his resurrection. But if I have done one thing in my life, I have established during this discussion beyond a reasonable doubt, that immersion was that act, and therefore I say here, that any other act, how sincerely soever performed or accepted is not the baptism Christ commanded, for by no other act can the profession be made which he requires, or the symbolism which He appointed.

Scriptural baptism consists of four things. 1. Its form. 2. Its design. 3. The Scriptural subject. 4. The proper authority—church.

I introduce another illustration from the distinguished writer I have quoted :

"If the condition of initiation into a Christian church were *circumcision*, would a society be a Christian church which, for this rite substituted baptism? If not, as little can a society be such, which, for baptism, substitutes sprinkling; and in either case the reason is the same, because in neither the necessary condition of membership is observed. If, too, membership would be invalidated by a want of its true condition, not less could it be by the substitution in the place of one that is unauthorized and spurious. Such a society fails of the character of a church. *First*, from wanting what it *ought* to have, that is *baptism*; and, *secondly*, from hav-

ing what it ought *not* to have, that is *sprinkling*; and *thirdly*, its anti-evangelical complexion is deepened from the perversion of calling an alien and incongruous substitute, by the name of Christian baptism. As we have seen that a Methodist society cannot be a Christian church, on account of the *want* of one rite, so neither can it be on account of its *practice* of another. It fails in one case from defect, in the other from excess; either of which is equally destructive of the common identity of two objects. Two societies cannot be the same, when one is destitute of what is essential to the existence of the other and introduces a dissimilar and unauthorized substitute into its place. It would seem more correct to say that such societies are directly antagonistic. If two things are the same, merely because they agree in some respects, there are no two things which are not the same. If a society be a Christian church simply because it is composed of believers, (which, however, as we have seen, is not true of the Methodist society at Carrollton,) no ritual service is necessary to its existence, which is equally contrary to the doctrine of all Christendom, to the dictates of reason, and the principles of revealed religion.

"We have asked, if a society should practice circumcision as a condition of membership, would such a society be a Christian church? and we have supposed that the question admits only of a negative answer; but this is, in effect, the very thing which Pedobaptists *do*. They practice sprinkling, or, as they say, baptism, as a substitute for circumcision. The two rites differ only in form, not in principle. They involve, according to Methodist views, the same privileges, and convey the same blessings. Hence Methodists are involved in the absurdity so fatal to all clear views of the Gospel dispensation of maintaining the identity of the Jewish state, and the Christian church. Infant baptism is essentially a Jewish element and a Methodist society may, in this respect, more properly be called a Jewish rather than a Christian church. Even if Methodist societies observed baptism instead of sprinkling, their erroneous, secular, and anti-Christian views respecting its design and import, would of itself actually destroy their claim to the character of Christian churches. The Jewish and secular elements, incorporated with their societies, darken the light of Christianity, carnalize their character, and instead of perfuming and embalming them with the pure word of life, corrupt and poison them with the doctrine of a hereditary religion, and the sacramental virtue of ordinances, thus imparting to them the taint of a moral infection."

The M. E. Society at this place, as everywhere else, is a body of professors and non-professors, and those unable to make any profession. All *unbaptized*, and therefore in no sense a Scriptural church. There is another feature that works a forfeiture, etc.—its six baptisms, and not one for a person Scripturally qualified, sprinkling, pouring and immersion, infant baptism, that of adult seekers.

It has no office for the baptism of a professedly regenerate person. This may strike some with astonishment; but I do

say here with the discipline in my hand and in the presence of Eld. Ditzler, that in this book there is no office for the baptism of a professed Christian man or woman. Wesley himself declared that the whole office for baptism of infants proceeded upon the supposition that they are born again at the same time they are baptized, and it is as certainly of adults also, as I will show if Eld. Ditzler presumes to question it.

THE M. E. SOCIETY AT CARROLLTON LACKS A THIRD ESSENTIAL FEATURE OF A CHRISTIAN CHURCH, VIZ., A SCRIPTURAL ORGANIZATION. Government implies laws, and laws authority to enact and enforce them, and execute their penalties. This authority must lodge somewhere. If in the hands of one man, then we have a *monarchy*. If this authority is without check, absolute and independent of limitation or control, then we have an absolute despotism. If this authority is lodged in the hands of a privileged few, then we have an Oligarchy. If in the hands of a privileged class, an Aristocracy. If in the hands of representatives chosen by the people, a Republic. If in the hands of the people, a Democracy. If in the hands of the priests of the body, then it is a Hierarchy. If it is constituted with law-making powers, it is a legislative body. If, with only power to *execute* the law, as already enacted, and by the people direct, then it is an Executive Democracy.

Jesus Christ did institute a specific government on earth, when He set up His Church, and He called it His Kingdom. He could not set up a church without giving it a specific form any more than an architect could build a house without giving it a particular form. This is self-evident. The first church Christ established was the mother and model of all future churches. We may safely say no church differing from this in form of government and administration, was ever set up by His apostles. The act in any one of them would have been high treason against the King. Christ has authorized no one, man or angel, to change the government He originally gave His church in one jot or tittle. That we represent the views of the most eminent writers and the most gifted Bishops of his own church, I submit a few extracts

from their published writings. For the following extracts from an editorial article in the *Methodist Quarterly* when it was published in Richmond, Virginia, some twenty years ago, and edited by Dr. Doggett, now Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, I am indebted to one of the editors of the *Georgia Index*. What will he say of his Chief Minister and master? They amount to nothing in Eld. Ditzler's esteem—cobwebs across his path!

Extract—1. "Unless the professed followers of Christ organize upon the apostolic model, *they are not a church of Christ*, although there may be members of the body of Christ, or Christians among them."

2. "Members and ministers professing the religion of Christ, may congregate together for the purpose of worship, and may organize yet *they will not be a church of Christ, unless they organize upon the apostolic model.*"

3. "The members of regular Christian associations, may be true members of Christ's body; may, by complying with the conditions of salvation, enter into the spiritual kingdom of God, and ultimately be saved, but *they do not belong to the church of God*, because the association, to which they attach themselves, was irregular, or was not a church of Christ, as wanting conformity with the true model, in the irregular particular, whatever it may be."

4. "We do not contend that an organization in accordance with the apostolic model is essential to salvation, but only *essential to make an organization a church.*"

5. "We do not suppose that *any unprejudiced mind* would call any body of men and women *the true church*, so particularly described by the inspired writers, as the true church has been, *unless it comes up fairly and fully*, in every minute particular, to a description proceeding from that wisdom that could not err in the description, in any remote or conceivable degree."

There is much more of similar import, in the article from which I extract, and the author, in the exuberance of his liberality, gives minute details to *Baptists*, as to the course *they* must needs pursue, if they would become members of an Episcopal church. He deems no church entitled to be recognized as a church of Christ, that has not an Episcopal form of government. So I say, of its *membership*, and of its *Baptism*, and of its *fundamental doctrines* and *origin*.

What is the form the Methodist Conference claims for American Methodism? They say it is "unique," *sui generis*, and so it is. I will let Rev G. G. Cookman speak. I read from his great Centennial Speech, in John Street Church, New York, endorsed by its official publication by the Methodist

Episcopal Church, 1851. And let me say here, that the bare quoting this extract from the speech of Elder Cookman—though published by the General Conference—has brought down more abuse upon my head than any other one act of my life! But if I can, by suffering this abuse, serve my dear Master and advance his great work, then let His will be done. He alludes to Ezekiel's vision of "Wheels within wheels," and says in his speeches, pages 145, 146 :

"Now, sir, let us apply this to Methodism. The *great iron wheel* in the system is *itinerancy* ; and truly it grinds some of us tremendously? the *brazen wheel*, attached and kept in motion by the former, is the *local ministry* ; the *golden wheel*, the *doctrine and discipline of the Church*, in full and successful operation. Now, sir, it is evident that the entire movement depends upon keeping the *great iron wheel of itinerancy* constantly and rapidly rolling round. But, to be more specific, and to make an application of this figure to American Methodism, let us carefully note the admirable and astounding movements of this wonderful machine. You will perceive there are wheels within wheels. *First, there is the great outer wheel of Episcopacy*, which accomplishes its entire revolution *once in four years*. To this there are attached *twenty-eight smaller wheels styled annual conferences*, moving around *once a year* ; to these are attached *one hundred wheels*, designated *presiding elders*, moving *twelve hundred other wheels*, termed *quarterly conferences*, every *three months* : to these are attached *four thousand wheels*, styled *traveling preachers*, moving round *once a month*, and communicating motion to *thirty thousand wheels*, called *class leaders*, moving round *once a week*, and who in turn, being attached to between *seven and eight hundred thousand wheels*, called *members*, give a sufficient impulse to whirl them round *every day*. O, sir, what a machine is this!"

Truly, "what a machine is this!" We say to every one, "Let us carefully note the admirable and astounding movements of this wonderful machine!" How potent for good—if controlled by angels! How omnipotent for evil—if turned by men!—Why, in essential character, it is the very system of the Jesuits of Rome! It is, in principle, a crushing military despotism. It is astounding! It is astounding that any set of men, after the American revolution, should have dared to fabricate, and set in motion, this *great Iron Wheel of Episcopacy*! Just look at it, and you see it is a perfect system of *passive obedience and non-resistance*. Every *smaller wheel* being "ATTACHED" to the wheel next in power above it, and the whole moving in absolute control of the GREAT OUTER WHEEL OF EPISCOPACY. The reflecting man must see at a glance, that

all real liberty of thought and action is destroyed as truly, by this system, as by the ecclesiastical system of Rome—as by the drill of an army—as by any despotism upon the face of the earth.

This then is the divine and sublime model of the Methodist Episcopal Church? But the Society at Carrollton is not this wheel! It must be a branch of it—but what branch was the Great Wheel? It must be one of the *lesser* wheels *if* any.

Well sir, it is true that the symbolic wheel of Ezekiel is the only semblance that God's Word affords for the government of the M. E. Church, and it is to my mind as authoritative as my opponent's position that the church of Christ is a continuation of the old Jewish Commonwealth in order to establish infant baptism. If there is any thing under the shining sun certain and made out, it is that the New Testament affords no more authority for this wheel within-a-wheel-government of the M. E. Church than it does for infant baptism. It is this painful fact that drives them into the shadows of a dark and superceded dispensation to find something that is strong enough to hold an inference, or bear an analogy.

Now let Eld. Ditzler answer, and let every man and woman who hears me, answer. Is this, can this be the Divine and apostolic model of the polity of the Christian Church? If you answer no, and you must answer *no*, then no religious organization possessing this can, in the language of Bishop Dogett be a church or a branch of the Church of Christ.

Replication.

To show still more clearly that "Methodism as it was," was a far different thing from "Methodism as it is," with its lofty and hollow pretensions, as well as to show that it is understood by the intelligent, we quote from the February number of the *North British Review*:

"For a long time even after the societies under his care had become very numerous, he would not allow his preachers to assemble their people during the ordinary hours of public worship on the Lord's day, and to the last he refused to give them a general permission to administer the sacraments. The people who joined him, he wished to remain still members of the Established Church, to attend upon her worship, and to receive seal-

ing ordinances in her communion. This is the position still maintained by that section of his followers who call themselves Primitive Methodists. Wesley's plans and arrangements were directed so as to afford to those who joined his society, advantages for growing in grace, for adorning their profession, and for promoting the interests of religion, *additional* to those they might possess as members of the Church of England and attending upon their ordinances. He *did not intend to form a distinct and separate Church*, and in *point of fact did not do so*. He does not seem to have reached any convictions, which appeared to him to make it men's duty to disapprove of the constitution of the Church of England, or to separate from her communion. So that Wesleyan Methodism, under its founder, *was not a Church, and did not profess to be a Church*, but only an Institute, regulated in its arrangements by present and temporary circumstances, and *supplementary* to the Church of England for promoting the Christian good of the community."

"Different considerations seem to show that Wesleyanism even yet scarcely professes to be a scripturally organized Church, and if so, it must be, in respect to its organization, a device of human wisdom, and therefore not destined to perpetuity, not fitted for permanence."

"Wesley did not profess to be organizing a Church upon a *scriptural* basis. His Institute (Methodism) was the product of *his own wisdom and sagacity*, and must be subject to the fluctuations and instability of all merely *human* things."

What unparalleled effrontery, then, for Methodists, in the face of these facts, to declare that their Society is a Christian *Church*, and *scripturally* organized!

Now I wish Elder Ditzler to know that there is a world-wide difference between originating an organization different from anything that can be found in the Bible, different from anything the world had ever before seen or heard of, and calling it a Church, and organizing a Christian Church. It is true that two or three baptized individuals can organize a Church, provided they adopt the apostolic model of government, and covenant to be governed by the sole authority of Jesus Christ.

Jesus Christ *originated* as well as gathered his disciples together into a body which he, during his public ministry taught them to call "*Church*," Matt. xviii, and there was a church—not completed to be sure in all things—just as much as there was on the day of Pentecost, when three thousand members were added to it, and this body of brethren was the body Christ sang in the midst of—so that the prophecy was fulfilled, "in the midst of the *Church* will I sing praises," etc.

No, sir. I am free to say I do not believe that God the Father, nor God the Holy Spirit ever thrust out John and Charles Wesley to originate and set up a church in opposition to and 'contravention of that of Jesus Christ, which they did do just so certainly as Jesus Christ had a church on earth then or now, for Methodism has violently antagonized and is today antagonizing and seeking to destroy every other religious organization on earth. Nor do I believe that Jesus Christ moved the Wesleys to set up a new church for himself—for he himself has declared that a house or kingdom divided against itself cannot stand, and if he had a church in their day or since, and Methodism was a part or branch of it, then he himself divided his own house and kingdom against itself!

Mark how he plays upon the words to confuse when he says all Baptist churches were organized by human beings, to nullify my position against men originating a society and calling it after Christ's body—Christian Church. A Baptist no more than a Methodist society *originated by men or angels* is or can be a Christian church, and should not be so called or fellowshipped. Whatever any *one* man here and there among Baptists may hold, Orthodox Baptist teachers do not hold that a company of Christian men can start a church by baptizing themselves, and if they *did*, the word of God does not warrant it. He has quoted Eld. Ripley a Baptist as admitting his society a *church* though *not in a state of order*, but Eld. Ditzler's own Bishop, Doggett, declares that a body of Christians not in a state of Gospel order *i. e.* orderly constituted, cannot be called or recognized as a church *at all*. To offset Eld. Ripley, I will quote the sentiments of two of the most distinguished Baptists in America, one in New England, and one in the South, who correctly represent the sentiments of all sound Baptists in America.

Dr. Wm. Hague, of Boston, says:

"However honored may be the history of any church on earth, however far it may be extended, with whatever names it may be distinguished and adorned, its pretence of being, as to its outward constitution, the true Church of Christ, is nullified by the fact that it is a Church established by human device. So far as it is established by man, so far as it is a part of a human system, just so far, constitutionally considered, it has lost the character of a true Church of Christ. So that the mere fact that a

Church is established by the legislation of a man or men, furnishes a sufficient reason why Christians should leave it, as having in its constitution those elements which are at war with the spiritual nature, the primary principles, and the high moral ends of the Christian dispensation.”—*Chris. Statesman*.

Dr. A. M. Poindexter, of Richmond, Va., says, on the Relation of Baptists to Unscriptural Church Bodies—

“Now, if the bodies to which reference has been made are not Scriptural churches, their ministers cannot be Scripturally ordained ministers. The ordination can have no force or validity beyond that which is imparted by the body whose act it is; and if that body is not a Scriptural church, of course its ordination cannot confer Scriptural authority.

“In view of these considerations, it follows that Scriptural churches should not recognize, in any way, these unscriptural organizations as Scriptural—either by word or action, as to the bodies themselves or their officers. The churches of Christ are to oppose all departures from the faith as delivered in the New Testament. They may not fraternize with or connive at heresy. And the obligation thus resting on Scriptural churches bears also upon every member and every officer of those churches. The whole body, and each individual, are called upon by fidelity to Christ and the truth to make a solemn, consistent and unceasing protest against fundamental error, whether relating to doctrine or to practice; and in the cases reviewed, both doctrine and practice are involved. No Baptist can, rightly or consistently, recognize a Pedobaptist church as a Scriptural church, or a Pedobaptist minister as a Scriptural minister.”

I perceive the Elder is a little chagrined at the picture of his holy people in England, called Methodists, as shown by his father, John Wesley, and asks me if I want to compare the piety of my people (Baptists) with his, etc. Comparisons are proverbially odious, but I will assure him they would suffer nothing in the comparison as to piety, and for what they have achieved for the world.

How he has answered my objections to the local Society in this place being a Scriptural church, let the world judge.

DR. DITZLER'S FOURTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—We come now to offset Dr. Graves' charge, and additionally meet his objections against admitting Pedobaptists as forming a part of God's Church, by exposing *his* to *all* the objections he offers and far more, and a hundred-fold more damaging. And we offer none but indubitable proof—the most impartial, elaborate, and learned historians of the very country where the parties acted, all supported by elaborate appended foot-notes containing the documents in the original languages then used—German and Latin.

[Mr. Graves interposed to stop Mr. Ditzler—that Baptist History had nothing to do with this question. Mr. Ditzler contended that Dr. Graves had assailed Methodist History most fiercely—reading pages from the worst part of the “Iron Wheel,” and all this, he claimed, to prove the Methodist were not a church. Their late origin, etc., and want of religion in its founders proved it, Dr. Graves urged, to be no church.] Now, not admitting a point he urged, we propose to show that all these charges with a thousand-fold force press against *his* church. But remember the facts already put in evidence on a former proposition, viz: that the Lord's Supper, or Baptism *is not* performed at all—it is not valid, not legal, not an ordinance of God unless *all the following* facts hold good:

- 1st. *That he must be immersed.*
- 2d. *For the right purpose.*
- 3d. *With the exact symbolism.*
- 4th. *By the rightful, legal authority*
- 5th. *As one already regenerated.*

If you fail in *any one* of these points, though *all else be right*, as a chain is never stronger than its weakest links, or one link severing is as fatal as if all parted, so here, if either of these points fails, no Baptist is baptized, has no right to God's ordinances, is not in the church, and cannot receive the Lord's Supper. All these points have been presented. Now let us examine this one feature with which we have now to do—first, *where did the English*, and second, *where did the American Baptists originate?* We rely solely on their own ablest, best and selected Historians, the facts confirmed by all general historians, such as Goodrich, Bancroft, Hinton, (Baptist) and others. Drs. Ford,

Orchard, Waller, *The Texas Baptist Pulpit*, and Dr. J. R. Graves, all agree, with their Western Editors, that "*No organization but a true Church of Christ visible, has any authority to administer Christian immersion.*" "*The Baptist*," July 4, 1868, by J. R. GRAVES. [See all the quotations in former proposition on communion, first Address.]

Benedict page 327, says, "John Smyth, the man who is said to have *baptized himself*, and thereby acquired the name of *Se Baptist*, is distinctly announced by Mr. Taylor, a Baptist, *their historian*, as THE FOUNDER of the English General Baptists, and that the Society grew out of a division of Robinson's congregation in Holland." This Smyth, Robinson, Clifton, etc., went from England, 1606 (Benedict, 328) Smyth was the chief actor, Robinson, the "Father of the Independents," *Ibid.* There they differed—fell out, quarreled, persecuted each other. They got up questions of discord, and "this alarmed those with whom Mr. Smyth held communion, and *they cast him out of the Church*, [he had been an Episcopal minister—was expelled or left, now he is expelled by the Independents.]

WALES.—"The first Baptist church in Wales was formed near Swansea, in that country, in 1649. Mr. John Miles was their chief leader, and they increased to about three hundred members by the year 1662." (Backus 1, 120, Bap. Lib.) "And at the house of J. Butterworth in Rehoboth, in 1663, John Miles, Elder, and six others, solemnly covenanted together as *a Church of Christ*," in Plymouth colony, America, having been driven out of Wales in 1662. In Swansea (America) "the church has continued by succession ever since, and is the fourth Baptist church in America." (Backus, 1, 120). The ridiculous and amusing myths that Benedict indulges in about churches in Wales (Baptist) *a la Orchard*, "although not always congregated in churches." (344) are not worthy of note.

AMERICAN BAPTISTS.—As most interest centers here, let us be very full and explicit. Let us see how Baptist writers that are now writing up matters to serve the succession purpose, write. Dr. Ford's "Origin of Baptists," so strongly commended by Dr. Graves, published by him, says, p. 23. "Five years anterior to the above law, in 1638, Hansard Knollys, a name enshrined in the temple of soul liberty, gathered together a Baptist Church," etc. Dr. Graves, *The Baptist*, October 30, 1875, by a correspondent, says: H. Knollys gathered the church at Dover in 1638. The church at Providence was formed in 1639."

Now, what are the facts? Dr. Backus, who "copied from their records," in giving his facts, thus tells it: "Mr. Hansard

Knollys was a minister in the Church of England for nine years, and then was so cruelly persecuted therein, that he came over to Boston in the spring of 1638; but their rulers called him an Antinomian, and would not suffer him there; therefore he went to Dover on Piscataqua river, where he preached nearly four years, and then returned to England, and arrived in London in December, 1641. As the war broke out there the next year, liberty for various opinions, was caused thereby (under Cromwell) and he became a Baptist, and gathered a church in London,² etc., (vol. 1, 103, Bap. Lib.) Benedict treats with silent contempt the assertions of Ford, etc. Backus gives the facts and shows that Knollys was an Episcopal minister, not only in 1638, but till after 1641, after his return to England. That is the way these partisans who have a purpose to serve, to keep up bigotry and war, record history.

Dr. Graves now comes in more immediately on the historic question. In *The Baptist* of October 2d, 1875, in a carefully prepared and elaborated editorial, Dr. Graves says: "This little affair [Roger Williams's church, 1639] in four months, came to nothing, and Williams repudiated it as an abortion and became a Familist. His self-baptized society died without a successor. It was no Baptist church, was not intended to be, and consequently no Baptist minister or church ever proceeded from it. Therefore Roger Williams was never a Baptist. One year before this [before 1639, i. e., 1638] the Island of Newport, R. I. had been settled by a colony of Baptists under John Clark, who organized in that year a regular Baptist church of which he was pastor. This was the first Baptist church in America." He then glorifies him at great length, as a very Copernicus and Kepler in history, in his sphere. Now for the facts.

Elder Backus, A. M. (Hist. Baptists in New Eng., vol. i, ch. iii, p. 101, 102, Bap. Lib.) says: "When such cruelty was experienced at Boston, Mr. John Clark, etc., etc., concluded to move away; and when they came to Providence Mr. Williams advised them to go to the Island of Aquidneck, and he went with them to Plymouth, etc." There they "signed a covenant on March 7th, 1638, in which they said, We do here solemnly, in the presence of Jehovah [now for a church, a genuine Baptist church—Dr. Graves' *beau idéal* of a spiritual church. Jehovah is invoked—hear] incorporate ourselves into [now for the church] a body politic and as he shall help will submit our persons lives and estates unto our Lord Jesus Christ," etc. Then follow their names. "This, I copied from their records," says Backus 102.

Benedict gives more fully all the details, exactly as above, but more in detail. He shows that "a Synod, held at Newton, now Cambridge "found" that their country was infected with no less than *eighty-two heretical opinions*," and solemnly condemned." "Wheelwright and Mrs. Ann Hutchinson, *both Pedobaptists*, were banished the jurisdiction, for what was called Antinomianism, etc. Mr. John Clark, an eminent physician, made a proposal "to remove out of a jurisdiction so full of bigotry and intolerance," 462. "At Providence they were kindly received by Mr. Williams, and being consulted 'about their designs, he readily presented two places before them—Sowarnus and Aquidneck, now Rhode Island, etc." "On their return, the 7th of March, 1638, the men, to the number of eighteen (18) incorporated themselves a body politic, and chose Wm. Coddington their Judge or Chief Magistrate." Benedict then gives the words of their compact as Backus has it, p. 463.

"The following spring (1639), Mr. Clark, with several others, removed to the south part of the Island, and commenced a settlement, to which they gave the name of *Newport*. The Governors are now named. "March 12, 1640, they changed their plan of government, and elected a governor, deputy governor," and disfranchised four men, and suspended others from *from voting* in their elections." Backus, 102 of vol. i. No CHURCH YET, nor *baptism*. And there is Dr. Graves' liberty-loving Clark, finally "Mr. Williams went over to England and obtained a charter which included them in his government." Backus, I. 102. Now for Dr. Graves' Newport Church, founded "one year before 1839, no trace is in existence as late as 1640, but "for the origin of *this* Church, we must go back to 1644." "Rev. John Clark, M. A., the founder of this church, became its *first* minister." So testify Backus, Benedict, Callender, Centennial Sermon by Dr. Elton, p. 210-212; Benedict, 465. Obadiah Holmes was his successor as "second pastor of this church." Dr. Graves asserts that they settled at Newport 1638. They did not settle or go to Newport till the spring of 1639. So far from being Baptists, not a Baptist was in the crew. A Synod condemned the opinions—"Pedobaptists" were the parties banished, so say the Baptist historians, and Clark was simply a layman and physician. Instead of organizing a church of any kind, they incorporated themselves into "a body politic"—a state. Williams was the one who received (and pointed out to them a home), this wandering band. Alas! to what desperate ends and resolves party spirit drives men. *Whence*

came Clark's baptism? No immersionists had yet come from England. And had any of Clark's band had it, as they were so near Roger Williams—he selected their home—went with them, and 1640, incorporated them in his little government—*had a Baptist* existed among them, so near, would he have had Ezekiel Holliman, a layman, and *only* sprinkled, to immerse him, and *he* in turn immerse Holliman and all the rest? Thus we see the *latest* dodge fails most signally, and exhibits Baptist historians in the true light of their favorite method of recording history. Among those Roger Williams baptized were Thos. Olney and Wm. Wickenden (Wiggington). Backus, I. 102; Benedict, 450.

The book Dr. Graves adduces to refute the above, “First Church in Providence,” by S. Adlam, tries to evade the force of the facts by asserting, very boldly, that *Wickenden* and Olney organized a church in 1652—the *existing* Church! What care we for *the existing* Church? The church presided over by Wickenden, was an offshoot of the other. Adlam tries to prove that Newport Church was founded “eight years before” 1652—*i. e.*, 1644, by Clark. But the *only* pretense is a mere conjecture against universal history, against the inscription on the old *Providence bell*, that it is inscribed on the tablet in its meeting house, that it was organized 1639. Adlam, p. 7. Adlam asserts Olney was the *original* pastor. He was baptized by Roger Williams, and it involves absurdity to say that he founded it so late as 1652, yet baptized 1639 with all the rest. No one, not even Adlam denies any of the facts. Olney had been a *sprinkled* Congregationalist, and came to Williams party 1638. Staples hits it when he shows there were *two* churches at Providence—one 1639, the other different in principle, 1652.

But Dr. Graves' dodge, quoting Clark's tomb inscription is astonishing. It does not say *when* he organized the Church at Newport at all. It says, as shown by all Baptist historians, that he was “one of the founders of the first Baptist Church in Newport,” that he “came to that Island from Massachusetts in March, 1638,” but does not tell *when* he organized the Church. But Mr Adlam states he organized it eight years before 1652, which exactly accords with the facts and dates we have given.

What now becomes of all Dr. Graves' efforts to evade the facts as to their origin from Roger Williams church? Where did Clark, the physician, get *his* baptism from with his Pedobaptist exiles, save from Williams? Now this Olney was baptized by Williams, as Backus, Benedict and all agree. He became Williams' successor as pastor till 1682. Backus, 102.

Wickenden, among the first accessions soon after the organization, 1639, and so baptized by the illegally baptized, baptizes Wm. Vaugn, who, with Wickenden, organized the second Baptist Church at Newport, and was its pastor till 1677. "A church had been formed in Providence under the care of Rev. Mr. Wickenden" of which he was pastor for many years. Now all these early pastors, Olney, Chad. Brown, Wickenden, John Clark all had *their* baptism and membership through Roger Williams. Hence all illegal, by Baptist rule as now interpreted, and the Baptists are not a church in any sense. Their baptisms, pastors, all come down through these channels.

What is the good, what the value, what profit to Christianity are all these absurd and unsupported claims? As Providence Church had successors long after 1682, what becomes of the bold assertion of Ford, Dr. Graves, etc., that it was no Baptist Church, and came to nothing in four months? Backus and Benedict show that twelve join it in a very short time, and that years afterwards it flourished. The English Baptists started by baptizing each other, as Williams and Holliman did. So testifies the Baptist historian. In Germany Anabaptists did the same. In America it is the same. Of all churches, therefore, your's is the most disjointed, irregular, and destitute of authority.

You claim descent through Peter Bruis (Petrobrusians) and Henry, founder of the Henricians. So say Ford, Orchard, Benedict and Dr. Graves. The first was a priest, the latter a monk and deacon of Clung, in the Roman Church, and the only baptism they had was in infancy in that church. Wickliffe and his Lollard disciples are claimed by these Baptists as Baptists. Wickliffe lived and died a member of the Catholic Church, baptized in infancy, never in adult age, and his Lollards were "poor priests," who died 'Catholics. (Giesler iv, 246-7.) Is it not wonderful that these men, supporters of Pope and hierarchy, are held as Baptists, as a Church therefore, yet we are denounced as mere Societies?

So John Huss and Jerome of Prague—claimed as Baptists in the chain running to the Apostles, lived and died in the Catholic Church, though as the others just named, protesting against such increasing abuses—all practiced Infant Baptism. The so-called Anabaptists of third and fourth, and succeeding centuries, baptized again, solely and alone because they split from Rome on mere questions of policy and discipline—had bishops, priests, confessionals, infant baptism as fully as the Roman Church. They are not Anabaptists in the sense those were in the sixteenth century at all. Yet Baptist historians take advantage of the mere word. and deceive their readers.

The only parties that failed to baptize infants, as Manicheans, did not baptize adults either. This Wall shows at great length. Yet Baptist historians so tell these facts as to make it appear these sects opposed infant baptism. Alas, when thus history has to be treated!

Dr. Graves opened the discussion on the Mode of Baptism with a glorification of Baptists as contrasted with other Christians. On every proposition this has been repeated. He has repeatedly, in every proposition, gone out of his way to assail as well as make flings at other churches, where there was no call for it, as well as to eulogize his own sect. He has spoken of the tyranny of bishops, ministers, etc., as if they were all on one side, and as if the Methodist church had any hand in such things. He, especially on the proposition yet before us, compared our church or people to the mud as compared with the flour—the true bread, with only a little flour mixed in—a body palsied, withered,—a mass of babes—unconscious babes as its membership on the one hand, and unconverted, unregenerate sinners, unbelievers on the other. Our baptism and Lord's supper, he avows, are given for regeneration, converting sinners. Our Bishops are charged with flagrant forgery. He quotes the bold assertions of his lowest, bitterest, most reckless partisans as the only evidence of the ugliest part of all this. For the rest, he garbles his extracts, misconstrues the language, and perverts the meaning of our Ritual, whether by accident or design, we pause not to enquire—the doing it through a want of correct information is as injurious as though designed. Our membership is so corrupt, carnal, unregenerate, that we are not a church.

We warned and urged him not to compel us to expose his side of the house. His argument is, we are not a church because of these things and our late origin.

Now, Sirs, we propose to examine into some of their teachings, their origin, and *their* history and membership, and test whether such things as he alleges destroy, in *his* estimation, church existence. Having utterly refuted his unsupported assertions and charges, and shown the glorious history and deeds of Methodism, we can well afford to compare notes.

BENEDICT, p. 60, 81, ranks the Anabaptists of Germany of the sixteenth century as Baptists. Quoting Orchard as his further authority, he endorses the following, he condensing it:

“He [Luther] and his colleagues had now to dispute their way with *hosts of Baptists all over Germany, Saxony, Thuringia, Switzerland, and other kingdoms*, for several years. Conferences on baptism were held in different kingdoms, which continued from 1516 to 1527. The support which the baptists

had from Luther's writings [used, garbled, etc., as authorities adduced by them, as a rule, always are] made the reformer's efforts of little effect." Yes, they soon paralyzed his arm. That is too true—sadly true. Catholics saw how to encourage the madmen, and hence the quotations Baptists can pile up as Pedobaptist concessions, etc. They were made to encourage and inflame rebellious and seditious parties, so that the secular arm might be invoked as it was by Catholic Princes and Monarchs to crush all Protestantism and Liberty. Dr. Ford, a Baptist on Origin of Baptists, 52-44, declares them "Baptists." Orchard, the Baptist Historian, endorsed and published by Dr. J. R. Graves, p. 349, says: "Of all the teachers of religion in Germany at this period, the Baptists best understood the doctrine of civil and religious liberty; to them, therefore the oppressed Boors, as has been observed, looked for counsel. The tyranny of the Catholics and Lutherans was equal in every thing, except extent. *Luther never pretended to dissent from the church, he only proposed to disown the Pope.* [*Italics his*]. * * Among the baptists, one of the *most eminent* was Thomas Munzer [Munser.] * * He had been a priest, but became a disciple of Luther, etc." Of the Anabaptists of these times Orchard, p. 362, says in italics: "*An unspeakable number of Baptists preferred death in its worst forms, says Mosheim, to a retraction of their sentiments.* Mosheim says no such thing. Orchard says this was "in almost all the countries of Europe." Baptist historians so distort all quotations, so garble authorities, as that you never, as a rule, get the meaning, or the real saying of the author. Moreover, their historians and writers, Tombes, Danvers, Delaune, Crosby, Stennett, Booth, Robinson, Iwimey, Jones, Orchard, not only thus act, but rely mainly on the lowest class of former inferior and unknown at large and wholly unrecognized writers by any class of scholars or historians, for their statements as well as on "the old works of Catholics," (Benedict, p. 62), who as inquisitors never examined into facts, made their loose statements, applied to various dissenting parties the most odious and hateful of terms—Anabaptists being one of them, and *solely and alone from THESE sources* and treated in this way, do Baptists of the *present day* seek to make out their case!!

Why, Dr. Graves and his brethren now go back on all their authorities in this country, Dr. Backus, whom Benedict pronounces "their (Baptists') indefatigable historian, (p. 422) who was selected for this purpose by the Baptists because of his ability and familiarity with the facts from early life, and "some of our [their] chief ministers requested me [him] to engage to write our history, in 1771," (Baptist Library 1, 89). He en-

gaged in it, and of it he says: "I spent much of my time [between thirty and forty years—1771 to 1804, besides the long years of study in these matters,] in going to and searching of the records of the old Colonies of Plymouth, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, etc. I also searched many other records and papers, as well as books of various kinds, and enquired of intelligent persons, to get all the light I could from every quarter, and our first volume was published in 1777, the second in 1784, and I never heard anything published against the work." He had access to "the publications of the Historical Society at Boston," also. This was all gotten up before the great wars of 1776 and 1812, when the records and facts were all on hand. He lived over a hundred years nearer the time than the men Dr. Graves now relies on. He had no succession theories to support—only truth. Now they have their wild hobby to support. He [Backus] is supported by Benedict, by Pres. Wm. Grimmell, Professor in Brown University, by Crosby, by Goodrich, Bancroft, by all the facts. But if all these Baptist authorities named, Crosby, Grimmell, Backus, and Benedict, and all the old Baptist chroniclers in whom Backus found help are all false—utterly untrue, confirms it not what I say—as historians, Baptists are wholly incorrect, one-sided, unreliable?

Bunyan is repudiated and denounced by Dr. Graves. R. Williams never was a Baptist, Benedict, Backus, etc., are false, and *we know* Orchard, Ford, Robinson and Jones are utterly unreliable. Seeing this is so, let us now give a history of these so-called Baptists of Germany, as the facts are, and are in hand now before me on my table (in Giesler, vol. v, 344 to 356; Hase, 421 to 601; Melancthon's Hist., Th. Munzer, Walch xvi, 206; Bullinger in Fussli, v. 121, iii, 229; Mosheim, 492 to 494, sec. iii, part ii.) We copy from Giesler, who supports every point with elaborate supporting foot-notes and documents most overwhelming, as he does on all leading points, and is the most reliable historian, as to facts, that has ever written.

"The first beginnings of these evils are to be sought for in the disturbances at Zwickau, in 1521. Thomas Munzer, who was minister at Zwickau," joined by "Stubauer, Stork, and other leaders of the same furious complexion, and excited the most unhappy tumults and commotions in Saxony," etc. (Mosheim). They taught "disregard of the written Word of God, the dead letter," by the "incarnation of Christ, men are at once entirely deified by God." (Giesler). The marriage and marriage-bed of the unbelieving and carnal, was whoredom

and devilish brothel. God revealed his will in dreams.

"But the Anabaptists in several places were encouraged thereby to adopt violent measures in order to carry out their fanatical designs. Early in 1525, Thomas Munzer made his appearance again in Thuringia, and relying on the support of his former alliances, he usurped dominion to himself, at Mulhausen in his character of prophet, in order to bring about a complete reformation in Church and State, and spread it through the surrounding countries by desolation and pillage."

"Munzer said on his trial by torture, 'He had stirred up this rebellion in order that Christendom might be brought to an equality, and that the nobles and gentry, who would not stand by the Gospel, and join their league, when invited to do so fraternally, should be banished and put to death. Their article was *omnia simul communia*, i. e., all things should be common, and distribution should be made to every man according to his need, as opportunity served. And whatsoever Duke, Count or Lord would not do this after having been summoned to do so, his head should be cut off, or he should be hung.' Compare Munzer's letters to the miners of Mansfield: 'Let not your sword cool in blood; forge Pinkepent on the arrival of Nimrod (i. e., the wicked nobles) cast his town to the ground; it is not possible so long as they live that ye should be free from the fear of man. The Word of God cannot be spoken to you while they rule over you. On! on! on! while ye have the day. God goes before you, follow, etc.'" He always signed his name "Thomas Munzer, with the sword of Gideon."

"It was Simon Stumpf, Grebel and Felix Manz, who invited them to constitute a peculiar church, in which should be a Christian people living, with all innocence, cleaving close to the Gospel, burdened neither with taxes, nor usury, nor any thing of the kind. On this occasion these expressions were used: 'It were nothing, unless the priests were put to death. Christians were neither bound to pay taxes nor tithes. All things must be common; there neither could nor should be any such persons in the church, who professed themselves to be without sin.' When they were foiled in this attempt they first began to impugn infant baptism.

Afterwards these fanatics at Twick, more than ever exasperated by their conferences with Zwingle, proceeded to entire denial of infant baptism, and so to rebaptize. The first man who allowed himself to be baptized by Grebel in Zurich was George Blaurock; afterwards many persons were baptized by Blaurock and Mantz in Zollikon, where John Brodli was minister, and now the fanaticism of the party broke out openly.

"The Anabaptists maintain that they are the only true church well-pleasing to God and the community of Christ, and teach that they who are received by rebaptism into their community, should have no communion with the Evangelical or any other church.

"I am the introducer of baptism * * * together with my elect brethren in Christ, Conrad Grebel, and Felix Mantz * * * Luther with his faction is a thief and murderer; Zwingle also, and Leo Judæ with their faction, are thieves and murderers." Gies. v, 356

Mosheim says, 492, 493 :

"It was this detestable faction that, in 1521, began their fanatical work, under the guidance of Munzer, Stubner, Storck, and other leaders of the same furious complexion, and excited the most unhappy tumults and commotions in Saxony and the adjacent countries. They related a great number of visions and revelations with which they pretended to have been favored from above. But when they saw that these methods of making proselytes were not attended with such rapid success as they fondly expected, and that the ministry of Luther, and other eminent reformers, proved detrimental to their cause, they had recourse to more expeditious measures, and madly attempted to propagate their fanatical doctrine by force of arms.

Munzer and his associates assembled in 1525 a numerous army, chiefly composed of the peasants of Suabia, Thuringia, Franconia, and Saxony, and, at the head of this credulous and deluded rabble, declared war against all laws, governments and magistrates of every kind, under the chimerical pretext that Christ was now to take the reins of civil and ecclesiastical government into his own hands, and to rule alone over the nations. But this seditious crowd was routed and dispersed without much difficulty by the elector of Saxony, and other princes. Munzer was ignominiously put to death, and his factious counsellors were scattered abroad in different places."

"Those who distinguished themselves by the enormity of their conduct in this infamous sect, were Louis Hetzler, Balthazar Hubmeyer, Felix Mantz, Conrad Grebel, Melchoir Hoffman, and George Jacob, who, if their power had seconded their designs, would have involved all Switzerland, Holland and Germany in tumult and bloodshed."

Mosheim continues on page 493:

"It is, nevertheless, certain that the greatest part of these wretched sufferers owed their unhappy fate to their rebellious principles and tumultuous proceedings, and that many also were punished for their temerity and imprudence, which had led them to the commission of various crimes.

There stands upon record a most shocking instance of this, in the dreadful commotions that were excited at Munster, in 1533, by some Dutch Anabaptists, who chose that city as the scene of their horrid operations, and committed in it such deeds as would surpass all credibility, were they not attested in a manner that excludes every doubt and uncertainty. * * * The bold ring-leaders of this furious tribe were John Matthison, John Bockhold, a tailor of Leyden, one Girard, with some others, whom the blind rage of enthusiasm, or the still more culpable principles of sedition, had embarked in this extravagant and desperate cause. They made themselves masters of the city of Munster, deposed the magistrates, and committed all the enormous crimes and ridiculous follies, which the most perverse and infernal imagination could suggest. John Bockhold was proclaimed king and legislator of this new hierarchy; but his reign was transitory, and his end deplorable; for Munster was, in 1536, retaken after a long siege by its bishop and sovereign, Count Waldeck, the new Jerusalem of the Anabaptists destroyed, and its monarch punished with a most painful and ignominious death."

In a note, page 494, Mosheim says further:

"John of Leyden, the Anabaptist King of Munster, had taken it into his head that God had made him a present of the cities of Amsterdam, Deventer and Wesel; in consequence of which, he sent bishops to these three places to preach *his* Gospel of sedition and carnage. About the beginning of the year 1535, twelve Anabaptists, of whom five were women, assembled at midnight in a private house at Amsterdam. One of them, who was a tailor by profession, fell into a trance, and, after having preached and prayed during a space of four hours, stripped himself naked, threw his clothes into the fire, and commanded all the assembly to do the same, in which he was obeyed without the least reluctance. He then ordered them to follow him through the streets in this state of nature, which they accordingly did, howling and bawling out, 'Wo! wo!! the wrath of God!! wo! to Babylon!!' When, after being seized, and brought before the magistrates, clothes were offered them to cover their indecency, they refused them obstinately, and cried aloud, 'We are the naked truth!!' When they were brought to the scaffold they sang, danced, and discovered all the marks of an enthusiastic phrenzy."

In the Black Forest, Tenger, in Zwabia, to the Rhenish Province—in Franconia, Thuringia and Saxony, as well as Zurich, they carried anarchy and insurrection. They claimed that they were subject to no law nor

prince. They succeeded in forcing the princes to submit to them in Bohemia. Once they had roused Zwingli's scruples on infant baptism. In Franconia, Alsace and Zwabia there already existed much discontent on account of oppression and abuses, so that they were as a spark of fire to a magazine, and frightful cruelty attended their insurrection there, 1525. At Weinsburg they murdered Count Lewis of Helfenstein. In the Black Forest they clamored for equality. That granted, they demanded blood. From the Black Forest the tri-colored standard of revolt was carried in triumph by the frenzied rabble. They resolved to force submission to their plans. They destroyed granaries, emptied cellars, demolished castles and fired convents. They had started out with the cry of equality—they now demanded blood and subjugation. The alarmed and undefended towns opened their gates and made common cause. As they went, images were defaced, crucifixes demolished, and even women swaggered through the streets, brandishing weapons before the monks. They captured the Counts of Lowenstein, whom they treated with marked ignominy, and compelled them to swear to their creed. They captured Wurtzburg and forced back the regular troops. Spires, Hesse, Alsace and the Palatinate were compelled to adopt their articles. The Margrave of Baden fled before them. Bavaria, Westphalia, Lorraine, the Tyrol and Saxony were threatened with a like uprising. The citadel of Wurtzburg was still held by the regular troops. The Reformers, shut up in the citadel, were fearfully assaulted, and the battle raged. Night witnessed the protracted struggle. The peasants were bloodthirsty, and the citadel determined. In the darkness of the night "the fortress, lighted up by a thousand battle-fires, seemed to resemble a towering giant pouring forth flames, and contending in the midst of bursts of thunder for the salvation of the empire from the savage bravery of infuriated hordes." Thus it continued till two in the morning. A force was coming against them from without, and the miserable fugitives were overthrown with fearful slaughter. They now reaped a terrible retribution. They had shown no mercy, and unfortunately received none in their hour of disaster. Their victorious enemy hung them at the road side. They put out their eyes. They imprisoned those who had been fenced in with the insurgents, and put to death many quiet and innocent people who happened to be in that region.

In Thuringia Munzer suppressed the lawful authority and usurped all authority. "We must exterminate with the sword, like Joshua, the Canaanitish nations," he cried. He pillaged convents and set on foot a community of goods. The lowest classes ceased to work and levied on the wealthier. If one asked a fitch of meat, a truss of hay, a piece of cloth, and it was refused, hanging was the penalty. Hearing of what was going on in Southern Germany, Munzer imagined his time to reign had come. He called for blood and carnage. "Forward," was his cry. "Heed not the cries of the ungodly—be you pitiless—let your swords be ever tinged with blood." Such was the madness that inflamed the heart of this man. The peasantry rose *en masse*. Mansfeld, Stotberg, Hesse, Brunswick and Schwarzburg joined his standard. They plundered convents. They destroyed the library of Reinhardsbrunn and violated the tombs of the Landgraves. The whole Reformation was threatened with overthrow, and the man who faced the Emperor and all Rome undaunted trembled before the madmen. The fanatic now signed himself "Munzer, armed with the sword of Gideon." Philip, Margrave of Hesse, drew the sword to meet the mob. Several dukes joined them on their way. Munzer had plenty of cannon, but no powder. The princes, in pity, proposed peace when they had surrounded the rabble. But the fanatic assured them God would come to their rescue. Just then a rainbow appeared in the clouds, and he seized it as an omen of good. He would receive all the balls of the enemies in his sleeve. To exasperate the enemy and show his contempt for them, he ordered the envoy from the princes to be cruelly put to death. May 15, 1525, Philip made the attack. The fanatics

began to sing and gazed for heaven to interpose. A volley from the cannon of the princes dispelled their delusion, when they fled in every direction. Five thousand perished, and their leader lost his head. (Ditzler's Phil. of Church His.)

And these are the madmen that Drs. Ford, Graves' by endorsing Orchard, Benedict, etc., claim as Baptists, and one of the great links in that chain that runs their succession back to John the Baptizer!! They will not fellowship us, nor allow that we are a church, nor commune even with our people that are dipped in the baptismal act, because *their* baptism was not valid, not being by one in the succession. But here they accept as genuine Baptists, priests of Rome and Catholics, who left that faith, but whose only baptism and ordinances were through Rome. Alas, for consistency!

Now, Sir, *there* is the *origin the first existence* of Baptist churches. They began in 1521. Their first preacher and founder was a Roman priest, a murderer and a most reckless instigator of robbery, rapine and persecution.

Then your first people in England were fanatics, persecutors, revilers, as Benedict, your greatest American historian puts in proof, p. 328, 329; 334-5. quoted by us in the first Address on this Proposition. The first thing your John Clark government did was to disfranchise and suspend the exercise of the rights of a number of their small band. So that in Germany, "Baptists" began in civil war, rapine, blood—in ignorance and debauchery—a community of goods and wives. In England they began in bigotry, a fierce persecution of their own people, put in evidence by their own standard historians as above, and pursued the same course in the American colonies, and now repudiate the only men of note or ability that were among them. And to-day Dr. Graves can recognize as Baptists the Roman Catholic Wickliffe, Huss, Jerome, Waldo, who never questioned the right and power of priestly absolution, Archbishops, Cardinals, confessional, unity of church and state, baptismal regeneration, purgatory—these are claimed as Baptists because simply they objected to refusing wine to the people in the Lord's Supper the reading of the Bible and a very few other such points, while we, who repudiate a hundred such errors, and press the Bible on our people, they cannot recognize even as a church.

But what care we for their recognition? We ask no acceptance. We plead for no accommodation. Methodism, that transcends all Baptist churches in her standards on piety, zeal and devotion in her membership and ministry, that has a government strictly based on the New Testament model: that to-day is as fresh as the dew that bejewels the petals of

the lily and the blushing buds of the rose, stands forth before the world clothed in the robes of diviner authority and with the sceptre of an invincible authority in her hand. She spoke to the infidelity of an age of scoffers, and their fury subsided. The Bolingbrokes, Humes, the voluptuous Chesterfields and Gibbons became abashed and stood rebuked before her immaculate presence. Baptist slothfulness and ignorance gave way before it, and her intolerance stood confounded. Not enumerating any babes, counting as we do only adults, no probationers, Methodism to-day numbers two to one against the Baptists throughout the United States or Europe. We have in the United States over, largely over, three millions of adult members. We go by the national statistics.

And now what care we for the rage and fury and abuse of our foes? Let them rage, let them swagger, let them froth at the mouth and gnash their teeth: Vain is their insolence, impotent their rage and harmless their spite. The surging billows of their infuriated bigotry may dash on against the rock whose imposing form and solid shaft towers sublimely above the rage of their malice; we repose in quiet and in peace.

"As some tall cliff that lifts its awful form,
Swells from the vale and midway leaves the storm,
Though round its breast the rolling clouds are spread.
Eternal sunshine settles on its head."

Why, sir, he dares to asperse our membership. He presumes to assail their piety. They are only too glad to hang upon our skirts, shelter in our wake, and feed upon the husks of our better food. They gladly gather up the crumbs from our tables. Why, sir, the Baptist Church is a mere hanger on to our ropes. Methodism is like one of our majestic steamers that moves up the current of the grand father of waters with an ease and power that overcomes all forces against it, and the Baptists are a mere tow-boat swinging behind, drawn on by the tremendous forces that impel the grander vessel of honor. Yes, sir, members and ministers that we expel for immorality, as oft I have personally known, they gladly accept as ministers and members, good enough for Baptists, then what must be our real, living membership and ministers?—[*Time out*

DR. GRAVES' FOURTH REPLY

ARGUMENT.

MR. PRESIDENT.—When I closed I was urging my third objection to Methodism, on the ground that its entire polity was unscriptural. I read from his own Bishop Doggett, whose words he may not question, that a body of Christians could not be considered a Christian Church, unless organized after the model found in the New Testament. This I approved. Then I showed from Cookman's work, published and endorsed by the General Conference, that the government of the Methodist Church was symbolized by the "Great Iron Wheel."

I want to hear Eld. Ditzler assail Cookman and this Wheel, when I will show you that he borrowed the illustration from the Father of the System.

The question is, Can Eld. Ditzler find the model of this Wheel-Church or polity in the New Testament? Will he attempt to do so? Will he claim that it is there? This is the plain issue to-day. Bishop Doggett says emphatically unless you can find this identical Wheel-power government in the New Testament, Methodist Societies, Conferences, Quarterly Annual, District, General, *separably, or all together, cannot be considered a Church, or branch of a Church of Christ.*

He has already impliedly taught that the New Testament does not afford a divinely fixed model of a Christian Church as a class of Hierarchalists do, and I may as well meet this right here. Is it not evident that the Judean churches were considered as models by Paul, who praised the Thessalonians for following their example: nor were the customs of different people allowed to influence churches in different provinces, but the teachers of religion throughout the world were to follow Paul's example. This model imitated, occasioned a harmony in practice for one hundred years. If there is no form, then the Scriptures cannot be a perfect rule of faith and practice: each province, town or society, may legislate without giving offense to the King of Zion: and consequently, every age, from new customs, might have a new form of Church government. Yet Jesus Christ has forbidden anything to be added to his word: and one feature of the *Man of Sin* is, that he should "change laws in God's temple;" but every plan not

of Scriptural authority shall be taken away, and every innovator in Christ's kingdom shall meet with his displeasure. The unity enjoined, the discipline established, the example left, and the accountability of each servant for his conduct in the service of God, prove there is a settled law for their guidance.

Historians are agreed that the apostles strictly patterned the churches they constituted after the model of the church which Christ himself organized, and which is called the Church at Jerusalem.

GEISLER says: "The new churches everywhere formed themselves on the model of the mother Church at Jerusalem.—Ch. Dis. Vol. i., § 29.

MOSHEIM says: "*That form* of the primitive churches which was derived from the Church of Jerusalem, erected and organized by the apostles themselves, must be accounted divine.—Vol. i. p. 81.

MCLEAN says: "This Church [of Jerusalem], so constituted, is the acknowledged pattern or model, by which other Christian churches were formed."

Now let us examine the claims of Cookman and Wesley's Wheel-form-Church.

If there is any part of it that has any claim to be considered a church, it is that to which the majority of the members belong—the local society—and this is the only part brought under discussion by our question—What are its governmental characteristics?

1. While the local Society here in Carrollton admits members not warranted by God's Word, and thus forfeits its Scriptural claims, *no active minister*—ITS OWN PASTOR CANNOT BE A MEMBER OF IT.

No active preacher, no pastor, no presiding elder, no bishop can be a member of a local M. E. Society like this at Carrollton? Will Methodists think of this? If it is indeed a Scriptural Church then Elder Ditzler nor any other Elder, or Bishop of the M. E. Church South, is a member of a Scriptural Church!!

But the apostles and apostolic ministers and pastors, and elders or bishops were members of the same organization with the lay members. James and the apostles were members of the church at Jerusalem. Paul and Barnabas at Antioch, and so throughout.

2. The local Society here at Carrollton, cannot receive or exclude members. This power is lodged in the traveling ministry alone—see Discipline. It cannot silence or discipline its own pastor or preacher for preaching the grossest heresy; for though guilty of the grossest immorality—some power outside and independent of the Society, alone can do this. But the local churches of the New Testament could receive and exclude members and discipline its elders. Matt. xviii. 1 Cor. xi. 2.

The local M. E. Society here cannot select its own minister or pastor, or determine his wages, or dismiss him when he becomes unprofitable and obnoxious to the members of it. But the religious teachers, pastors, evangelists and apostles belonged to the churches and were the property—the servants and not the masters of the churches. They could not only call upon them authoritatively to preach to them, but send them to preach to others.

This local M. E. Society has no power to recognize the call or ordain one of its members whom it may decide has a call to preach the gospel. Men not members of it decide upon this matter—and if they see fit, ordain him, and when once ordained, his membership is removed from this Society forever, and his name is enrolled in the Annual Conference, which is no church at all, and no Methodist that ever lived or wrote, ever claimed it was a church, and he becomes from that hour no longer amenable to the local Society for his doctrinal views or his conduct. This local M. E. Society has no control of the Gospel, is not nor can be a missionary body—cannot in any respect preach the gospel to others by her ministers and her means.

She has no preacher under its control to send, nor is it allowed to send a preacher to any specific field it deemed fit, and to control his movements. Methodist preachers all belong to the Presiding Elders and Bishops who alone have power to silence them from preaching altogether, or send them to mission fields or not, as they and the Conference may decide.

The local Methodist Episcopal Society in this place cannot select the Minister it may desire to preach to them next year. He is selected and sent by the Bishop with the advice of the Presiding Elder, and they *must* receive him whether they will or not. They may protest before hand against an unacceptable minister, and more likely than otherwise he will be the very one who will be sent to teach them subordination. Many such cases have occurred, and one but recently in Dallas, Texas. But a Scriptural Church can call and dismiss its own ministers.

The Methodist Episcopal Society here cannot own the house of worship or the ground on which it rests, though bought with the money of its own members. The property must be legally deeded to Conference, and so that the house and lot can be exclusively owned and controlled by Conference. The Methodist Episcopal Society here, cannot open the doors of its house of worship and *invite any Minister they please, even though a Methodist, to preach to them next Sunday, or any other day*. The membership have no voice whatever in the

matter—the preacher in charge and stewards have absolute control over the pulpit, and who may preach or lecture or talk in their Meeting House.

I now notice a main and fundamental objection that applies to the Conference, one and all, separately and collectively as well as to this local Society.

IV THE LOCAL METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN CARROLLTON IS NOT AN INDEPENDENT BODY, AND THEREFORE LACKS A FUNDAMENTAL CHARACTERISTIC OF A CHURCH OF CHRIST:

Now, Eld. Ditzler, changing the verbiage of the proposition, admitted what was fatal to the claims of the local Society here, and fatal to the claims of any other body of Methodists anywhere as to Conference, being a Christian or Scriptural Church. He says it is a “part of” the proposition, “branch of,” either expressions admit that the local Society here is not *independent*, as no Conference is—no branch of, or Wheel-in-the-Wheel system is—unless it is the General Conference.

But the Discipline teaches that it takes every local society like this in the whole South, thousands of them, with all the Conferences, to make one M. E. Church, and it names it “The M. E. Church South.” You cannot speak properly and say the M. E. Churches South. It takes the sum of all its parts to make the one body, the one M. E. Church South. No one local Society in the South can be considered a church, unless it be separate from the General Conference. Such a body is not a Scriptural or Evangelical Christian Church, and ought not to be called or recognized as such.

I will now define a Scriptural Church, as regards its polity and powers, and these define its character, whether Democratic or otherwise, whether legislative or executive only

SEC. 1.—Each particular Church is independent of every other body, civil or ecclesiastical, and receiving its authority directly from Christ, it is accountable to him alone.”

SEC. 2—*Powers of a Church.*—The members of each particular Church are invested with full power to receive those whom they judge worthy into their fellowship, administer the discipline of the body, try, censure, and expel the unworthy, by a vote of the assembled body, in accordance with the teachings of the New Testament.

SEC. 3.—It is the right and duty of the members of each Church to select and elect their own teachers, pastors, and officers, and dismiss them when they judge best for the interest of that particular Church; such officers being accountable to the Church for malfeasance in office or unchristian conduct, as are the private members.

SEC. 4.—Each particular Church, being independent and sovereign, is the highest source of authority, and from its decisions there can be no appeal; it, however, can reconsider its own decisions, whenever the majority is in favor of a reconsideration.

SEC. 5.—It is the right and duty of each Church; as such, to decide and declare what it considers the teachings of Christ are respecting Church

order, Church ordinances, laws, terms of communion, Christian doctrine and duties, and to govern its members accordingly.

SEC. 6.—These powers, rights, and duties, cannot be delegated, nor conceded or alienated with impunity.

I will present my proofs in support of each :

1. Throughout the New Testament we nowhere find all the churches in one country, or province, or city, spoken of as *one* Church, as the Church of Asia, of Galatia, of Judea, Samaria, etc., but invariably Churches. I can only refer you to the passages : Acts ix. 31 ; xv. 41 ; xvi. 5 ; xix. 37. Rom. xvi. 4, 16. 1. Cor. vii. 17 ; xi. 16 ; xiv. 33, 34 ; xvi. 1, 19, 23 ; xi. 8, 28 ; xii. 13. Gal. i. 23. 1. Thes. ii. 14. 2. Thes. i. 4.

There are instances where by a figure of speech called *synecdoche*, where a part is put for the whole, or one for all ; the term church is used in place of churches, and in the sense of kingdom since it takes all the visible churches of Christ to make the Kingdom of Christ, as it takes all the States of this Union to make the Republic, and all the Provinces of Great Britian to make the Kingdom of Great Britian.

HISTORICAL AND OTHER AUTHORITY.

THE EARLIEST WRITERS.—Tertullian says, "*Ubi tres ecclesia est, licet laici*," three are sufficient to form a Church, although they be laymen.

Dionysius Alexandrinus wrote to Stephen, Bishop of Rome, thus : "Understand now, O brother, that *all the churches* throughout the East, yea, and beyond, are united together, which aforetime were divided and at discord among themselves. All the governors of *the churches* everywhere are at one," etc.—Eusebius, 1 7, c. 3 (*vide passim*).

IRENEUS : *Ea que est in quoque loco ecclesia*," that church which is in any place.

SOCRATES SCHOLASTICUS : "For this noisome pestilence beginning from *the churches* of Alexandria." "Not only presidents and elders of *the churches*."

EGISIPPUS : When they were gone, it is said they were rulers over—i. e., officers in—"CHURCHES"—Eusebius, 1, 3, c. 17.

SOZOMENUS : Partly to set in order whole churches.

IRENEUS : "All *the churches* of Asia."—Eusebius, 1, 4, 13.

EUAGRIUS : Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, wrote in a letter to John, bishop of Antioch : "Christ hath granted peace unto *the churches* under heaven." "Seeing that as well your *churches* as ours."—Euagrius, lib. 1. c. 6

Ignatius, Cyprian, and Origen, when speaking of a particular congregation, call it a *Church*, as "the Church in Alexandria," "the Church in Smyrna," "the Church in Athens," and in Antioch. The above are the oldest and all the writers of note in the first six centuries, and the like phrases abound throughout their writings. No such thing as a national church or a consolidated hierarchy was known in these centuries, but the seeds that afterwards ripened into such an establishment were beginning to be sown. "After the idea of the Mosaic priesthood had been adopted in the Christian Church, the clergy, as was natural, elevated themselves far above the laity."—Giesler, vol. i. p., 69.

"What is the Church? It is not the clergy, it is not the councils, still less is it the Pope. It is *the Christian people*, it is the *faithful*."—D'Aubigne

[A. D. 117-193.] "*All congregations were independent of one another, although some had a peculiar reputation more than others, on account of many circumstances, ex. gr., their apostolic origin, the importance of the city to which they belonged, or because they were mother churches.*"—*Giesler*, ch. iii. § 53.

[A. D. 100.] "*All the churches in those primitive times were independent bodies; or none of them were subject to the jurisdiction of any other. It is as clear as the noonday, that all Christian churches had equal rights, and were, in all respects, on a footing of equality.*"

"During a great part of this [the second] century, all the churches continued to be, as at first, independent of each other, or were connected by no consociations or confederation; each church was a kind of little independent republic, governed by its own laws."

"Although the ancient mode of Church government seemed, in general to remain unaltered [A. D. 300-400], yet there was a gradual deflection from its rules, and an approximation towards the form of monarchy."

"This change in the form of ecclesiastical government was followed by a corrupt state of the clergy."—*Mosheim*, vol. i. pp. 86, 142, 201. See also, *Neander, Coleman, Orchard, passim.*

"The Church is undoubtedly *one*, and so is the Human Race one, but not as a *society*. It was *from the first* composed of *distinct societies*; which were called one, because formed on *common principles*. It is one society, only when considered as to its *future* existence."

"The church is *one*, then, not as consisting of one society, but because the various societies or churches *were then modeled, and ought still to be so*, on the same principles, and because they *enjoy common privileges*."—*Kingdom of Christ*, by Archbishop Whately (the highest authority in his day in the Church of England.)

The learned Dr. Owen fully maintains that in no approved writer for two hundred years after Christ, is mention made of any organized, visibly professing Church, except a local congregation."—*Owen* as quoted by *Crowell (Church Manual, p. 36).*

"The usual and common acceptance of the word [ecclesia] is that of a particular Church, that is, a society of Christians, meeting together in one place under their proper pastors, for the performance of religious worship and the exercising of Christian Discipline."—*Chancellor King, vide Primitive Church.*

Respecting the powers of each local church I submit the following :

SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

Mat. xviii. 14-20. Here the Savior gives the minute details with respect to an offending member. If the offender cannot be brought to repentance by private remonstrance, he is to be arraigned before the whole church—his brethren, his peers, and by them his case is tried and decided. If he will not submit to the decision of the Church, he is to be expelled. There is no higher ecclesiastical court to which he can appeal. He may apply to another Church, and that Church being an "independent republic," can receive him, if it is satisfied that the judgment of the excluding Church was immature or unjust. Mark well: the Savior did not say, tell it to the class leader, or the preacher in charge; he did not say, report it to the committee, or to the Session of ruling elders, did not say, tell it to the clergy the Conference, the Presbytery, or the Assembly, but to the church—the assembled membership of any particular Church, and if the voice of that body is not heard, when it is according to his teachings, expel him, and he would ratify the act in heaven.

1. Cor. v.—the whole chapter. There was an offending member in the Church at Corinth. Paul exhorted the brethren to exercise the needed

discipline ; mark, he did not write to the preacher or the Session to administer the discipline, but to the Church—the members of it. See ver. 4: “In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are come together, [*i. e.*, as a Church, evidently], and my Spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such an one unto Satan,” etc. See Mat. xviii. 20, 17, 18

That the supreme judicial and executive powers are vested in the membership, is evident, from ver. 7; “Purge out the old leaven, *i. e.*, expel from your body and fellowship—from the house of God every unworthy member. This was addressed, not to the clergy, or the elders, but to the membership of the Church. Such a command could not be addressed to the Methodist Episcopal Church, North or South, nor to the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, nor yet to the Presbyterian Church of Geneva, of France, of Scotland, or America.

Again, Vers. 12, 18, “Do ye not judge them that are within? But them that are without God judgeth.”

2 Cor. ii.—Read the whole chapter. The offending man above had been tried, and excluded from the Church at Corinth, and had now bitterly and truly repented of his sin, as every Christian will; and Paul knowing this to be the case, writes again to the Church—the brethren, the members—entreating them to restore the penitent man. He does not command them, but affectionately beseeches them to restore to the penitent their former fellowship, saying, Sufficient to such a man is this punishment, which was inflicted of many—the voice of the whole, or of the majority of the membership. The clergy, or the elders are not so much as once named in either of these instructions to the Church.

Rev., chapters ii. iii.—The instructions and reproofs Christ gave to the seven churches in Asia, respecting discipline, doctrine, or duty, were not addressed to bishops of Asia, or to ruling elders of the seven churches, but to the members of each Church, through its ministers, thus recognizing them as invested with the supreme judicial and disciplinary powers; and he teaches them also that they are, as churches, directly responsible to him, and that he will inflict punishment for disobedience—blot out their organizations.

The apostle Paul, we have seen, did not presume, upon his own authority, to expel or receive a member into the Church at Corinth, nor did Peter receive the first Gentiles upon his own authority. He first took six brethren (enough to constitute two or three churches) with him, and when Cornelius and his friends professed faith in Christ, and demanded the rights and privileges of Christians, Peter evidently referred them to his brethren, saying, “Can any man forbid these persons to be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?”

Touching the right of the members of each Church to have a voice in the selection of their teachers and pastors, and the election of their officers, we urge two arguments:—

1. It is the inalienable right of all men to elect their rulers, or officers and teachers; and the New Testament nowhere denies to Christians the exercise of it.

2. The examples of such elections in the New Testament teach, that it is both the right and duty of church members to elect their teachers and officers. See Acts i, 15-27. The assembled Church elected, by their votes, an apostle in the place of Judas.

Acts vi, 1, 6. The whole Church is called together, and, by their suffrage, they elect seven deacons, who are ordained by the apostles.

2 Cor. viii, 18, 19, 23. A brother is chosen of the churches, to accompany Titus and Paul to bear their benefactions, and distribute them among the poor saints in Jerusalem.

See also Acts xv, 1, 2, 4, 12, 22, 23, 30. The brethren at Antioch were brought into confusion by the teaching of certain Judaizing teachers, who had come down from Judea. They determined to ask for the advice of their brethren of the Church in Jerusalem, and of the apostles. They,

the brethren, chose and sent messengers to go up and consult with them, and defray their expenses. These messengers go up and call the Church together, with the apostles and elders. The Church determined, with the aid of the apostles, what advice to give, and wrote a letter to the brethren at Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia, &c. The messengers returned to Antioch, and "gathered the multitude together," and submitted the epistle to them.

Now here are substantial Scriptural and historical facts, and I challenge my opponent to meet them in a fair scholarly manner, or frankly to surrender them as he did the Covenants as a ground for the support of infant baptism. Now with the New Testament model before me, I urge a fundamental and fatal objection against the M. E. local Society or any local M. E. Society being a Scriptural Church—

BECAUSE IT CANNOT DECIDE WHO MAY BECOME MEMBERS OF IT AND RECEIVE ITS ORDINANCES. IT CANNOT DISCIPLINE THOSE WHO ARE. IT CANNOT EXCLUDE ONE FROM ITS MEMBERSHIP HOWEVER IMMORAL OR WICKED. NO ONE OF THEM CAN CHOOSE AND DISMISS ITS OWN OFFICERS AND INSTRUCTORS. IT CANNOT LICENSE A BROTHER TO EXHORT, see Dis. Ch. 3, sec. xiii. IT CANNOT FLECT A CLASS-LEADER, see ch. 3, sec. xiv. IT CANNOT CHOOSE ITS OWN STEWARDS, sec. xv. IT CANNOT CHOOSE ITS OWN TRUSTEES, ch. 3, sec. xvi. IT CANNOT SELECT, ELECT OR ORDAIN ITS OWN DEACONS, see ch. 3, sec. vii. IT CANNOT ELECT ITS ELDERS OR BISHOPS, NOR IS ANY ONE OF ALL THESE, AMENABLE TO ANY LOCAL M. E. SOCIETY ON EARTH FOR HIS CONDUCT. IT IS NOT LIKE THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCHES, INDEPENDENT OF ALL OTHER BODIES, SO AS TO BE CONTROLLED BY NONE, BUT EACH LOCAL SOCIETY IS BUT A VERY SMALL FRACTIONAL PART OF WHAT REALLY IS KNOWN AS THE METHODIST CHURCH—the Methodist system in America.

My next argument in support of the negative of this proposition is—

VI. THE POLITY OF AMERICAN METHODISM IS HIERARCHICAL, WHICH IS IN PALPABLE CONTRADICTION TO THE TEACHINGS OF CHRIST, AND IN CONTRAVENTION OF THE GENIUS OF CHRISTIANITY.

The entire government is in the hands of its priests, for according to its teachings, its ordinances being "Sacraments," its ministers are, *bona fide*, priests as much as those of the other Episcopal branches of the great apostacy.

The late weak attempt of the General Conference to introduce lay representation, was more in name than reality. Let us examine the Revised Statute Book.

The first body in which a layman can appear is the Annual Conference. What proportion of laymen to ministers, none can tell. All the traveling preachers in the Presiding Elder's

District, whether ten or twenty, and four laymen—one of whom may be a local preacher—and of course is always sure to be—three laymen to each Presiding Elder's District, against all the preachers, but these lay members can have no voice in the trial of their Ministers—THE METHODIST MINISTRY IS IN NO WAY RESPONSIBLE TO THE LAITY.

The General Conference is composed of one minister and one layman for every twenty-eight members of each Annual Conference—but one-fourth of these laymen may be local preachers and therefore *will most certainly be*, so that a proportion of ministers to laymen in the General Conference is as four to three. So that if the clergy can upon each question carry but a few lay votes, as they always can, they can as effectually as ever carry all their measures.

Now the General Conference assumes to itself the supreme control of all matters pertaining to Methodism, and if there is a church in the system, the General Conference must be that body, the local Society certainly is not—for I have demonstrated two things. 1. *That the local Societies do not possess a simple characteristic of Scriptural Churches.* This will not be successfully disputed—and 2. That if they are, then there is not a Methodist traveling preacher, Presiding Elder or bishop that belongs to a Christian Church of any sort, unless there are two distinct churches in Methodism,—the Annual Conference being one—and no one has ever yet claimed that it was a church, (*and I will say here by way of a parenthesis, would it not be well for Elder Ditzler to tell us of what Church he is a member—at what place and what is its name.*)

The General Conference claims the right to make whatever laws or rites it pleases, to change or abolish any or all existing ones, make, change or abolish any or all religious ceremonies, and it has the power to withdraw its jurisdiction from any Society or any number of Societies it pleases, to *divide* or even *abolish* the whole organization at will, and make another. This power was decided to belong to the General Conference by the Supreme Court of the United States in the property case, the sole, sovereign, irresponsible, absolute and all-controlling power of the General Conference, was set up by the Counsel employed by the Church South, and upon this plea the Church South won her share of the property. I will present a brief history of that affair and the arguments employed, because the decision of Judge Nelson brings us face to face with this fact. The General Conference is all the Church or semblance of it there is in connection with Methodism; and is it a Church? If so then, what follows? There is not a Bishop, Elder or Layman in the United States, a mem-

ber of it!! For a full history of the whole matter I refer all to a book published by the M. E. Church, South, entitled the Methodist Church Property Case.

In 1844, there was but one General Conference in the United States. At its session in New York city, Bishop Andrew, of Georgia, was deposed from his bishopric, for the crime of being a master, as Philemon was, and as thousands of the New Testament Christians were! A plan of separation, and the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was mutually agreed to; and it was also agreed that the Church, South, should have and hold all the churches, schools, colleges, cemeteries, etc., lying within their specified limits, together with an equitable share of the funds of the "Book Concern." This is all transparent so far; [as is the fact, that all the Methodist meeting-houses, school-houses, colleges, graveyards, in the entire South, and the Book Concern thrown in, belong not to the membership who built them, but to the bishops and traveling preachers—the traveling clergy!!

But after the adjournment of Conference, the Northern managers refused to give up the four hundred thousand dollars falling to the South from the Book Concern, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, through its commissioners, instituted a suit for the rendition of these funds.

The two "Churches" armed themselves for the conflict, securing the most powerful legal talent in the nation. Reverdy Johnson and Mr. Lord appeared for the "Church," South, and Hon. Rufus Choate, and Wood, for the Northern "Church." Now, what had the Church, South, to prove to the satisfaction of the court, in order to get a legal claim to one dollar of that fund? Simply this:

"That there never *was*, nor is *now*, a Methodist Church outside of the General Conference, which is composed of *bishops* and *traveling preachers only*! and, consequently, the absolute right and control of all the Church property is vested in the General Conference alone, as well as all the powers of legislation—the people called Methodists having *no voice* and *no appeal* whatever, as to whether the Methodist Episcopal Church should divide into two, or two thousand parts; or, as to what division it might see fit to make of the Church property."

The counsel for the Church, South, set itself to the work of proving this, and the bishops, and commissioners, and leading men furnished them with the needful documents, which would be admitted as standards on both sides—next of importance to the Discipline: among these was "*The History of the Methodist Discipline.*"

We give specimens of the pleadings by the counsel for the South.

Mr. Lord—"In vain you look into this Methodist system, prior to 1808, for any restrictions on the General Conference of that Church. If that

body had chosen to become Socinians—if it had chosen to adopt the Presbyterian or Baptist forms, either of government or of doctrine, it was in its power to do it. There was no limit. They represented the Church—they *were* the Church. The Church dispensed its light from the preachers. The laity were not known in the governing body. Matters of doctrine, discipline, and everything were in the governing body. If that was so up to 1808, what was that body after that period? *It was the same General Conference.*—Property Case, p. 163.

Hon. R. Johnson—"This Church, be it remembered, even unto the present time, and I speak it in no offensive sense, as regards its government, has been absolutely, since the days of Wesley, an aristocracy. Laymen have had, and now have no voice in it. If there is a layman within the sound of my voice, *he knows he has no voice now.* Heretofore, they have been satisfied with the government. They acted upon the saying of Pope—

"For forms of government let fools contest;
That which is best administered, is best."

They perhaps, will be found changing their opinion, when they find it is not always "best administered."

"Now, I want to know, if the entire sovereign power of the Church was in the ministers, the preachers, what other body on the face of God's earth was there in 1808 upon which to devolve the power of dividing the Church, which must have been in the ministers, than the Conference of 1808. The ministers made the Church. The ministers, in the governmental sense, *are the Church.* The sovereigns are the ministers, and if it be a part of the sovereign power, in a body of this description, to divide itself, then that power existed in the Conference of ministers of 1809, or it is gone. The admission is, that it cannot be extinguished. It is absolute, inherent, and inalienable, as my brother, Mr. Choate, admitted. A body unlimited in the authority to destroy, is responsible only to their consciences for the manner in which their authority is exercised."—*Meth. Ch. Prop. Case*, p. 381.

Again, speaking of the action of the Conference of 1784 :

"They admit no constituency. The time is perhaps coming when, in all probability, they will be obliged to admit one for the good of the Church. They resolve for themselves, and for themselves *alone*, as the possessors of all ecclesiastical power known to the Methodist Church, to carry out the particular organization authorized by John Wesley, without any other authority than his, and their own conviction that the good of the Church demanded such a special and particular organization." And still further on page 329, Mr. Johnson continues : "No *modicum* of power was left elsewhere. The Church was not to look elsewhere for any portion of authority."

We give the summing of this evidence in the forcible language of Elder Henderson, in his discussion with Mr. Hamil.

"Here are two of the first lawyers in the Union, employed by the complainants, the commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, to defend their right to an equitable division of the "Church property," before the Circuit Court of the United States, relying wholly upon the evidence which they furnished to their hand, declaring what? That the Conference of 1784, composed of sixty traveling preachers, with Messrs. Asbury and Coke at their head, in adopting the doctrines and discipline of that Church, 'admit no constituency'—that 'not one particle of power was left elsewhere; that laymen have had, and now have no voice in it; that ministers compose the Church; that in a governmental sense they are the Church; that it is absolutely an aristocracy; that it possesses unlimited power to create and to destroy; that it could have become Socinian had it chosen to do so; and that it is responsible to no tribunal on earth, but the consciences of those who wield its authority!'"

All this, and much more of like character, was solemnly pronounced, as already intimated, by two of the ablest lawyers of the United States, before one of the highest judicial functionaries of the country, as an exposition of Methodist Episcopacy, and published to the world under the auspices of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South and North! And yet, for daring to question its republicanism, we are to be denounced by its patented journals as a "demagogue," a bigot, an ignoramus, a legitimate child of the father of lies!

After the case had been thoroughly argued by both sides, Judge Nelson delivered the opinion of the court, which sustained every position taken by the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Here is an extract:

"2. As to the power of the General Conference to authorize a separation of the Church organization.

"The Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States was established, in its government, doctrine, and discipline, by a General Conference of the traveling preachers in this communion, in 1784. Down to that time, the Methodist societies in America had been governed by John Wesley, the founder of this denomination of Christians, through the agency of his assistants. During this year, the entire government was taken into the hands of the traveling preachers with his approbation and assent. They organized it, established its doctrines and discipline, and appointed the several authorities, superintendents or bishops, ministers, and preachers, to administer its polity, and promulgate its doctrines and teachings throughout the land. From that time to this, the source and fountain of all its temporal power are the traveling preachers in this connection in General Conference assembled. The lay members of the Church have no part or connection with its governmental organization, and never had. The traveling preachers comprise the embodiment of its power, ecclesiastical and temporal; and, when assembled in General Conference, according to the usages and discipline of the Church, represent themselves, and have no constituents; and thus the organization continued until the year 1808, when a modification took place."—*Appendix Prop. Case, pp.10-11.*

Upon this decision Elder Henderson justly remarks:

"The decision of the court, then, sustains every position taken by the counsel. We will state these positions again in still fewer words, confirmed by the extract from the opinion of the court: All the *deriv d* power which the bishops and clergy of the Methodist Episcopal Church ever had, came, not from the churches, but from John Wesley. They established its doctrines and discipline, created its officers to administer its polity; they are the source and fountain of all its powers; laymen have no connection with its governmental organization, and never had; and when assembled in General Conference, according to the usage and discipline of the Church, represent themselves, *and have no constituents!* No bill of exceptions was filed to this decision."

"The Methodist Episcopal Church, North, yielded to, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, accepted the award! Both divisions of the Church stand committed to this decision, as containing a true and faithful exposition of the governmental economy of that Church. Why have we never heard these lawyers and judges denounced as demagogues and bigots, and as ignorant of the subject they were adjudicating? They aver, that so far as government is concerned, (and that is the only subject we are discussing,) the bishops and traveling clergy are, *de facto*, the Church; that in its legislative and administrative economy, its lay members are unknown; that it is an aristocracy and has no constituents. Now, if all

this were untrue, can any man suppose for one moment, that the North would have yielded its claim to four hundred thousand dollars, and that the South would have accepted it? Is the 'Democratic element' in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, (if it ever existed), worth only four hundred thousand dollars? And yet, to secure that pitiful sum, the six hundred thousand private members in the Southern division of that Church, and, we may add, a larger number in the Northern division, aggregating a million and a half, or nearly so, of American citizens, are recognized by the public records of the country, in their ecclesiastical relations, as below the rank of common citizens—as being no constituents! We do not design to introduce degrading comparisons; but we must be permitted to ask, what more humiliating language could be used in regard to the subjects of the most absolute despotism on earth, than that they 'have no constituents?' Methodists! local preachers, and private members! lovers of God, of truth, of liberty, and of your country!

'If you have nature in you, bear it not!'

From the above revelations made by the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, through its counsel we learn the astounding fact, That the bishops and traveling preachers have been for over seventy years practicing a monstrous fraud upon the membership—how many, besides the bishops, have done it knowingly, before the revelations of the above-mentioned lawsuit, I will not presume to say; but *since* the publication of that 'Case,' all do, or ought to know it.

What are Methodist preachers doing, but gathering men and women into their "societies," persuading them that they are joining a *Church*, when they are joining a *local society*; when so far from it, they are not even joining the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the bishops and preachers know it! They are keeping by their teachings, thousands of Christians in those societies, who verily think they are in the Methodist Episcopal Church, when their teachers know they are not in it, and never can get into it!

The General Conference alone is the Methodist Episcopal Church. Those who belong to societies have no part or connection with its governmental organization, and never had. Says Judge Nelson above, "The traveling preachers, when in General Conference assembled, constitute the Methodist Episcopal Church, *representing only themselves, and have no constituents.*"

If we should grant that this is the Methodist Episcopal "Church" (which it is not, nor ever was), then there is not a Methodist on earth at present a member of it, elder or bishop!

The truth of our position admits of no discussion. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, proved it in open court, and was compelled to establish its truth beyond cavil, in order to gain one dollar of that book fund. The Methodist Episcopal Church did establish the fact to the satisfaction of

the court, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, North, admitted the fact, and gave up the funds without taking an appeal.

In the face of these facts—in the face of the American public—how long will Methodist bishops and preachers continue to deceive and mislead the people? How long will they have the hardihood to assert in the face of the decision of Judge Nelson, by which they obtained nearly a half million dollars of their book fund, that the local societies are churches in any sense, or that the laity have any part or connection with the General Conference, or that Methodist preachers are the representatives of the laity? The Book Concern, on the cliff, in Nashville, is a standing monument of the falsity of such a position; aye, every puff of the engine that drives the machinery that prints the papers and books in which these statements are made, testifies to their falsehood!

I have now discharged my duty to the thousands of deceived Christians in Methodist Societies. If they will read this, or the "Property Case," published by the "Book Concern," they will know, that even if the Methodist Episcopal Church be a Scriptural Church, they are not in it, and have no ecclesiastical connection with it. The societies of which they are members are not churches, and they are, therefore, unbaptized! Think of it, not a bishop or a traveling preacher has his membership in a society where the laity are—they do not belong to the societies!

The reader will find a satisfactory reason in this, why Baptists should not recognize the ecclesiastical and ministerial relations of Methodist preachers by ministerial association, or by inviting them to participate in ministerial functions.

If I have spoken *plainly* on this subject, I have spoken *kindly*, and with the best of motives.—[*Time out.*

DR. DITZLER'S FIFTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—The Doctor drew the red-hot thunder-bolt, and well may he and his people writhe under it. We warned, we admonished, but all to no effect, and we let fly the lightning-charged-bolt of historic truth upon him. He thinks Orchard's, Robinson's, etc., are admirable histories and truthful records. There is not a historian of standing in the Baptist church to-day that believes it—NOT ONE! There is not an important event in church history, that they treat of, but that they utterly distort the truth, suppress facts, mutilate or re-construct, so as to leave a false impression on the reader, and seven times out of ten, the narration is positively false, and the truth suppressed. They are simply burlesques on history. Do they not, for example, put down the Donatists as Baptists? The Novatianists as Baptists? The Manichæans, the Wickliffites, the Hussites—all as Baptists? Look at these parties. The Donatists, as Wall proves, and Dr. Cramp, Baptist historian, acknowledges, practiced infant baptism in the third and fourth centuries—had bishops, priests, confessional, and all the peculiarities of the Catholic church—yet THESE are Baptists! The founder came out from the Roman church—had his baptism thence. What do you do with that? The Novatianists were founded by Novatian whose baptism you remember we had up in Prop. i. who was baptized by sprinkling, lying in his bed. He never had it any other way, as they admit. Thus a main link, is a sprinkled Roman Catholic, who gets mad, and sets up a church of his own. He was a Presbyterian—yet was now ambitious of a bishopric, and being defeated, he set up a schism, and held all leading features of Romanism—infant baptism, three orders of ministers, consolidated church—YET WERE BAPTISTS! The Manichæans refused baptism of water to all persons whatsoever, adults or infants, holding that the devil made a large part of the Bible, made man, water, etc., and so this party rejected baptism wholly. Yet such men as Orchard tell us they REFUSED TO BAPTIZE INFANTS, which is utterly FALSE, for as they would not baptize at all, it is false to say they refused it to INFANTS. As for Wickliffe, Huss and Jerome of Prague, they all lived and died Catholics—having held high and distinguished positions in that church. As Rome was always aggressing against the rights of the people, the priests over

people, the bishops over the priests, the archbishops over the bishops, and the Pope over all these, eternal conflict raged through all these centuries. As each attempt to abridge the rights of the other order was made, it was for long years resisted with more or less fury and zeal.

Not till 1215 was the Bible publicly suppressed. Not till the thirteenth century was the attempt made with success to rob the people of the cup in the sacrament. In some remote parts these encroachments against the clergy and laity were stubbornly resisted even to mobs and skirmishes, as was the case in Bohemia in the days of Huss. Now, because these Catholics resisted the never-ending encroachments on their long-enjoyed rights in these things, these so-called historians, Orchard, etc., set them down as Baptists, and links in their chain of succession!! These parties baptized all their infants, used affusion as well as dipping, had Archbishops, Cardinals, confessional—altogether Roman Catholics. Doctor Graves cannot recognize Presbyterians, Disciples, Methodists, Episcopalians, as churches, but he can these parties! “Consistency, thou art a jewel.”

Let us review all the points now he has sought to make. As to our Discipline, the Ritual has been explained, and needs not repetition. His construction is on a par with most of the conclusions he draws.

He fears there will be tens of thousands of “bran new churches,” by our course. Well, God grant that there may be! Is not every new congregation a new church? Is not every new organization among you, a new church? It is alarming then, for these to increase, is it? Oh, but he means new denominations. Well, if they all do as much good as we did, as all the standard Baptist historians—Jeter, Benedict, Cramp, Backus, show we did, let them multiply.

He attempts to argue now, government implies form—laws, forms to execute them. He says Jesus Christ did institute such a specific form—the first was a mother church and model of all the rest. Well, that is progress.

He formerly told us the church was first organized on the Mount—Matt. v, vi, viii, where the sermon was delivered. Then,

1. It was composed exclusively of preachers, with (1) no lay members, (2) no women, (3) no officer.

2. It was established without any baptism, or naming of the subject.

3. It had no baptism, no Lord’s Supper, as yet, no authority to baptize, nor to preach. No commission to them to preach was given till some time after this, Matt. x.

Now where was there a model in this for a church, especially in the only sense you say there can be a church? Where now the essentials—the *diferentia* he spoke of formerly? Alas! it gets to be worse and worse.

He now comes out and says I define the invisible, spiritual church. Why, he denied in a former proposition—that on Infant Baptism—that there was such a thing. He sees now clearly that there is such an existence.

I not only define the one—I define both—have done it repeatedly.

He waxes desperate and says “Not a Baptist minister ever had anything to do with Roger Williams. If that is so, then Bancroft, Benedict, Backus, Cramp,—the three last the three standard Baptist Historians of America, all are guilty of falsehood most palpable. The leading Baptist ministers of those times got their baptism from him, Olney directly, Wickenden, etc., Vaughn indirectly by getting it in line through Olney. He said Butler’s Analogy did more to wipe out infidelity than Wesleys’s work! Then,

1. Why does it not do so now?
2. If Analogy is such a weapon, why did you so disparage it when accusing me of using arguments founded on analogy?
3. Every historian knows it is utterly untrue and shows it?
4. The great mass of people were reached at once by Wesley, whereas the Analogy can only be understood by the educated. Pitiably, indeed, is this subterfuge. The masses knew about as much about the Analogy as they did of the Vedas.

He wants to know where Bishop Marvin’s and my membership exists?

1. Where was Paul’s, Peter’s, Silas’?
2. Where the Seventy’s membership?
3. Where is the membership of their missionaries when in transit to their distant fields?

Now when he answers correctly any one of these questions he will have answered his own. We have shown repeatedly, that the membership of all is in the family of God, and membership there entitles to fellowship with brethren, and that fellowship and association was a visible representation of the church, and through these organized bodies the work of the church was carried on, and visible contact with it recognized. This explains his next question—Where was the church till 1739? Did I not see daily around me the blinding power of prejudice and passion, I could hardly realize that such a question was put to us. How often must we explain that all the saved constitute God’s Church. That any part of these may organize themselves together and they form a visible, tangible

church or body of churches. They may be called Methodists or Presbyterians—it does not affect the fact. Hence God has always had a Church—always. Let me now ask, Where was the church up to 1607–8 when the first Baptist church that ever was on earth, was established—organized? Where had the church been all that time?

He tells us what Mosheim tells us about Anabaptists being lost in the depths of antiquity, and that is proof they run to the Apostolic day and are the same as Baptists! Mosheim shows that they are not Baptists. Giesler, Bingham, Hase, Neander, all show it perfectly.

Now let me explain to you what these historians mean by Anabaptists in the earlier ages—third, fourth and fifth centuries. In the fierce persecutions of the third century many people gave up their Bibles at the command of the tyrant king to be burned. They were called Traditores, those who delivered up their bibles. After the persecution had passed, many came forward and desired to be admitted to communion. The church held them off—demanded penitence and proof of reformation or deep contrition, then after a time admitted them. This so incensed some ministers—fanatics—that they declared that one who had fallen never could be restored, and that they ought not to allow these *lapsi* or fallen ones to be restored to the church. A split ensued. One party went off, and denounced the other majority party as fallen and no church. Hence being no church, she could not administer its ordinances. Hence they rebaptized all who came to them from the Catholic church. Now that is the sole cause of their rise—the sole ground of difference, and Dr. Graves will not, dare not deny it, for we have the full facts, details, etc., in all the histories of the church, and the original histories and literature covering those times. Now that is what constituted the party Anabaptists then. Other troubles later caused others to be so called. Infant baptism was not involved. Wall shows that they baptized infants as regularly as the other wing of the church, had the same orders, confessional, and all that belonged to Rome. Moreover, they came out from Rome—had their baptism thence and all their credentials. These are the links that chain you to the Apostolic times as Baptists!!

As the Doctor strikes in the dark, yet keeps on at it in the vain hope that out of so much beating the air he will hit somebody, he levels a blow at our revivals. Well, if he wants this audience to become unmanageable—to become uproarious, let him get me to describing Baptist revivals. But we hope a better judgment will prevail. At Hardin, the second town from here west on the R. R., the past fall they had a revival

and fully half, if I was correctly informed there a few days before this debate, are backslidden already. They picked up movers and passing stragglers and immersed them. They immersed "little children," only seven and eight to nine years old.

Two parties—known to leading men in this house now, joined the Baptists, and were immersed in "a hope" they had indulged eighteen (18) years before, though wicked since that time!

In Texas, while there last winter, in Denton county, they, responsible men, told me of a Baptist preacher who committed a crime unnamable—and against one entrusted to his protection and education as a brother-in-law, and then he shot an uncle of the ruined party dead who sought to revenge the outrage, yet what do Baptists do? Now, such an act might occur in any church, bad men get into all churches. But the point is, your congregationalism offers no protection against scoundrels. It is the government of unchecked majorities unlimited by laws, balances, etc. It is mobocracy. A neighboring Baptist church, fully posted on this infamous wretch, called him as their pastor!!! Look at Plymouth church, and look how we get at offenders? We have the fine balance of law and order, the rights of minorities carefully secured. In your church minorities have no security. A popular preacher or a few wealthy members may secure verdicts, and there is no established standard, no system of laws defining juries, moderators, rights and duties, and securing the administration of justice. The purity of the church and ministry must be secured.

Our church government has bishops, the New Testament had them. They were "overseers," then, Acts xx, 27-29, in the flock, the church, and they are so with us. The whole church in its representative character then made all rules, laws, regulations of a general character, as we abundantly proved, see Acts i, viii, 9-20; xi, 1-17; xv, 1-21, so we do now. Each individual congregation had the application of law, management of its officers. So they have among us now. We are completely apostolic.

But in vain have I called for him to examine the history of church action and order in the Gospel or the Acts of the Apostles. No, no; he cannot be induced even to tell us of what church Philip made the Eunuch a member when he baptized him. Baptist church government has no show in this book, the Bible. It can do far better out in the fog of the dark ages, about Donatists, Petrobrussians, Lollards,

Hussites, and Hittites, Danites, and all other Ites, where the people are totally unable to trace up and examine the foundation of such claims, anything is better than the Bible.

Why, we have done all we could, we proposed to him in a letter to restrict this whole question to the Scriptures, as the wording of the proposition clearly demanded this, and it was their wording. But no, he utterly refused. And what has he relied on to meet us here? He reads from a speech-made, or article written by Deems, when in a great fog and muddle, and seriously contemplating leaving us—from one by Bascom, when about to sever his connection with us—this he admits, and one from Jessee Lee, and one purporting to be by Doggett on what constitutes the church. As to the last, it is not in evidence that Bishop Doggett wrote the article. Because he was editor is far from being proof of that. If he did write it, and Dr. Graves has reported him faithfully, it is unscriptural, unmethodistic, and anti-Wesleyan. So we let it pass. As to the rest, it is unworthy of a debater to throw out a drag-net and haul in all the vituperation and abuse of men who were, he tells us, disappointed, chagrined, mortified, mad—the passionate expressions of such hours, and introduce them as witnesses. All civil courts, loving justice, rule out such testimony directly or indirectly. Is such fit to be introduced as testimony in the courts of God?

He tells us that no sprinkled man is a Baptist. Then why claim Novatian, Ford, as Waller, and Orchard—these all published and endorsed by Dr. Graves—and Wickliffites, and Hussites, and Donatists—all of whom practiced affusion and dipping both, while all Baptist writers on immersion tell us of the sprinkling of Novatian.

He tells us a brother is here waiting and anxious to meet me in debate on these historic points. We reply, Dr. Graves has published Orchard and Waller's "Baptists not Protestants." He is before the country endorsed as no other Baptist is, and we challenge him to meet us at Liberty, Mo., and there we can test Orchard fully. Let him defend him if he can.

Meanwhile Dr. Graves assumes that they are the embodiment of, and Christianity itself! That is very modest. We would whisper to him from Burns—

"O ye who are sae gude yoursel,
Sae pious and sae holy,
You've nought to do but mark and tell
Your neighbors' faults and folly."
———"I bless and praise thy matchless might,
When thousands thou hast left in night,
That I am here before thy sight
For gifts and grace,

A burning and a shinin' light
To a' this place."

But, under which king? Which is the real Baptist church? As there is but the one true church, which is it? There are at least nine litigants in the ecclesiastical court here—each puts in its claim to be the Baptist church. Who is oldest? The General Baptists are. Whence came the next in order, the Particular Baptists? They split off from the General. So Benedict, Backus, Cramp tell us, and give dates and names and places. After this they split from age to age. Now the Particular, or Calvinistic wing, got their baptism from the General Baptists. The Hard-shells, the Primitives, etc., all claim that the Baptist body represented by Dr. Graves split off from them—forsook the confession of 1646, which was iron-clad in Calvinism. The facts of faith confirm this as the correct view. Yet they assume to be the Baptist church.

All minor matters may be passed in silence. We have now met all his points and turned them against him. What can he do? We have proved all our points and commit them to the record.—*Time out.*

DR. GRAVES' FIFTH REPLY.

Replication.

MR. PRESIDENT:—Professedly I am replying, actually—I am leading on this as I did on his former affirmative. He exhausted his resources in his first speech, as is his wont, and for the rest of time rehashes what he has said and fills up his time with irrelevant matter, a discussion abounding in the perversion of Baptist history. Well, I offer this excuse for him, he does the best he can—if he had any valid arguments with which to support his affirmative, he would not be slow in bringing them forward and urging them with an unwearied persistence and audacity, but he offers none because he has none.

Only a few words before I proceed with my arguments on refutation. The question before us, Is not whether there has been an unbroken succession of Baptist Churches from those planted by the apostles until this day, but does *the local M. E. Society in this place possess the Scriptural characteristics of a Christian Church?* This is the question Eld. Ditzler agreed upon his Christian honor to discuss with me upon this day, and this is the very question he persistently refuses to discuss. He refuses to give a definition of a visible church—one that is on this earth—and has organization, a living membership and ordinances. He never has in connection with this question, nor throughout this debate. I have asked him—how many times?—if he will endorse the definition found in the xiii Article of this Discipline, which he has sworn on bended knee, before his superior officers to hold and teach, and he has not done it. I use glasses, but I am not deaf. Have you heard him, Mr. President? Have you heard him Gentlemen Moderators? Has any man or woman in this audience? Let that one hold up his hand. I pause for the signal. NO ONE HAS HEARD YOU ENDORSE THE DEFINITION OF YOUR DISCIPLINE and no one will hear you do so. Mark my words. Nor will you attempt to give a Scriptural definition of a Christian Church.

Of the Church Universal and Church Invisible I know nothing, nor does Eld. Ditzler. They are the creatures of the imagination only, *purely ideal conceptions*—with which we have nothing to do. They were never “set up” either in Eden or in Abraham’s family, in the wilderness nor “in the days of the Kings” of the Fourth Universal Earthly Empire, the Roman Cæsars. See Dan. ii. 44. Christ never “built” nor rebuilt or

established either. The invisible church had never "fallen down" as the tabernacle of David did, to be set up again, which he says was spoken of the Church of God, and then tells us that the Church of God is the Church Invisible—and may exist intact though every Christian be cut off this earth! Need I waste my time exposing such crudities, such contradictions and absurdities? I did not devote one moment in noticing his fourth speech. I could not dignify it with a notice. I could not by a notice seem to imply that it belonged to this discussion—it is a matter he has prepared for another discussion upon the church question—but lest my silence should be misconstrued, I will say here, there was not a solitary position in it all, that I cannot easily refute, that seemed to militate against the claims of Baptists to a succession of churches—or in the language of eminent Pedobaptist historians, Drs. Ypeig and Durmont—that Baptists may be considered the only religious community that has stood since the days of the Apostles and has preserved pure the doctrines of the Gospel through all ages.

I say again the question is not what Baptists, past or present have believed or do believe, or whether an unbroken succession of Baptist churches can be clearly proven; there have been some who think so and some who think otherwise. But what has that matter to do with this question before us, which reads, "*The M. E. Society at Carrollton, Mo.*"—that body that worships across the street, the "preacher in charge" of which is before me, possesses the scriptural characteristics of a church. The question is not what Bunyan, of England, or Jeter, of Richmond, or other open communionists, and so-called liberal Baptists think upon the succession, for men less acquainted with historical matters could scarcely be found among the best informed of our ministers, but the question is touching the characteristics of this M. E. Society in this town. It is not whether John the Baptist gathered and constituted a church himself, which is what Bunyan denied, and what no Baptist on earth ever affirmed, but did not John Wesley originate, and devise, and set up without consulting the Divine model, this local M. E. Society in this place, and is it patterned after the New Testament model?

Now I will ask my opponent to answer two questions when he gets up, questions fundamental and vital to the settlement of these questions.

- I. WILL HE ENDORSE AND AGREE TO SETTLE THIS QUESTION BY THE DEFINITION OF CHURCH GIVEN IN ART. XIII, AND THE POWERS OF EACH PARTICULAR CHURCH GIVEN IN ART. XII, OF

HIS DISCIPLINE TO WHICH I HAVE SO OFTEN CALLED HIS ATTENTION?

II. WILL HE TELL ME TO WHAT CHURCH HE BELONGS—PRESIDING ELDER OR ANY BISHOP OF THE M. E. CHURCH, AND IF IT IS TO A LOCAL SOCIETY LIKE THIS IN CARROLLTON?

The answer of these questions invariably and conclusively settle the one before us, i. e., if Elder Ditzler claims that he or any Presiding Elder or Methodist member in this house or the Bishops of the M. E. Church, do indeed belong to any organization that is claimed, by any one, to possess the scriptural characteristics of a Christian Church. I am determined that this last question shall be answered, or the fact that it *is not* and cannot be, shall be known throughout the land. I will advise Elder Ditzler that he can never conquer a peace nor stop the mouths of Baptists, if he can the Disciples, until he answers this question. I know that he belongs to an Annual Conference, which I know, all Methodists know, and all men should know, is not a Christian Church, or "branch of the same." But whether he professes to hold actual membership in any other organization, I want him to say, and answer loud enough for all to hear, and if he cannot do it, why, then, what? He can abuse and misrepresent the Baptist denomination, and furiously assail those men, whether historians or editors, authors or writers, who have rendered their memories justly illustrious and dear to every Baptist heart, by boldly and faithfully defending Baptist principles and vindicating their history from obscurity and reproach, but he confesses that he has no church membership, nor any other Methodist minister.

While waiting upon him for his arguments I will present you with my own.

ARGUMENT CONTINUED.

Though should we grant that Episcopacy, as recognized by the Anglican Church is Scriptural, *which Wesley boldly* declares it is not, yet Methodist Episcopacy—the wheel-within-wheel Episcopacy—is so utterly different from it, certainly cannot be Scriptural, for nothing like it was ever found in the Scriptures. It was evidently framed for an ignorant membership, as the Episcopal Prayer book was for an ignorant, prayerless priesthood, by men who could write prayers for those who could not pray. Says Dr. Deems, when editor of the *Southern Pulpit*, and his article was copied into the *Nashville Advocate*:

"If we may apply the figure to Methodism, we can very readily see that a government suited to the sooty colliers of England, servants, and the uncultivated, who had grown up amid all the peculiarities of an aristocratic country, might hardly be fit for a Church among whose laymen are presidents and professors in colleges, judges of supreme courts, senators,

and men liberalized by professional learning and polite associations. The fact is, John Wesley formed *Societies*; ours is a *Church*. John Wesley did not make government a special study; but being a strong man and a violent Tory, and finding a sect gathering around him to be governed, he seized the reins—he became autocrat; and through his helpers, he governed most ably. It was very natural that when our Church was formed, it should be built somewhat after the model of the ‘societies’ of Wesley. Is it not too exact a copy, and may it not need mending? Even if Wesley had made government a study, and was by nature superior to the mass he controlled, there are laymen in our Church in this day, as great natively as Wesley, who have paid much more attention to the science of government. This is said with great deference and much veneration for many things in the character of John Wesley. He was before his times; ours before him.”

Joseph Walker, of Dallas county, Ala., wrote this in 1826:—

“I was personally acquainted with Bishop Asbury. I have heard him converse with the Rev. Hope Hull, who was a friend to reform, and I easily collected the information that our Church government was framed chiefly by subjects of Great Britain. Of course I never wondered much that such men should have shaped their code, and made their ecclesiastical laws, according to their own model. But when I consider that nearly all our present preachers are Americans; when I consider how excellent and powerful is the republican spirit which prevails in these United States, and how equal the civil laws under which we live; when I see how carefully our civil and religious liberties are secured to the people of every possible variety of denomination, I am compelled to ask the question, Is not the form of our Church government, and the manner in which it is administered, an open insult to the Constitution of the United States? It surely is; and were it fully investigated and exposed to public view, such a despotic institution would make a bad appearance before the observation of a religious republic.”

But I have said that a Hierarchical Government like that of Methodism contradicts the teachings of Christ and contravenes the genius of Christianity. It rejects the only headship of Christ in and over his church. Paul tells us by the Holy Spirit that Christ is head over all things to his church, which is his body—Eph. i.

This principle explicitly establishes the theocratic character of the Christian Church, and that in its visible operations it is an executive body only, never a legislative one. It has no power to make, change, or abolish the least law for the observance of its members. It can add no rite, change no rite, abolish no rite or ceremony. The commandments of men, and the tradition of its Elders have no lawful place within it. Should any local church so far depart as to practice one rite, one ordinance, one law or doctrine enacted by men, its worship would be vain, in the estimation of Christ, and it would forfeit its evangelical character. He himself hath said, “In vain do they worship me, who teach for doctrines the commandments of men,” and he charges those who do this with making the law of God of none effect.

“Ye do make the law of God of none effect by your traditions.”

Now I have shown that the sprinkling ceremony, and infant

baptism and unregenerate membership, practised by the local M. E. Society here, are one and all traditions of men. Eld. Ditzler nor any other man has ever found one syllable, precept or example in the Bible to warrant them, and therefore, these work a forfeiture of all its claims upon Scripture for warrant.

But who and where is the sole head of this little Society here? It is not independent of outside control, as I have shown. It cannot own or control the house it worships in though bought with its money. It cannot receive, nor discipline, nor exclude its own members, or decide whom it can fellowship. It cannot call or dismiss its own ministers, nor are those who preach for it in any way amenable to it for their doctrines or their conduct. It cannot determine what the word of God teaches for doctrines. It cannot take the New Testament alone for its Ritual, its Confession of Faith and its Book of Discipline, but it is shut up to one book for all these, and that not the New Testament but a Discipline made by fallible men, human law-makers, the General Conference. And through this law book the claim, the right to change save in one or two particulars and they do change every four years, and have already changed it twenty-five different times since 1784. So that what was once a sin that would have excluded a member, is now no longer a sin, and *vice versa*!!

One thing is clear as noon-day, that Christ is not head over all things to the little local M. E. Society in Carrollton, nor to the M. E. organization of America, but the Conference is—the General Conference is head over all things to the local M. E. Societies throughout the South—they are not therefore the Churches of Christ, nor can they be said to be the body or a part of the body, for Christ is the supreme and only head of *his* body, which is his church.

Nor is Christ head over all things to the General Conference. It does not claim that it must govern itself solely by the laws, and observe the rites laid down in the New Testament, but it claims to itself the iniquitous and papal prerogatives of Anti-Christ, the man of sin, to make and to change laws, to institute and abolish rites and ceremonies for its members.

Mr. President, the enormity of the sin of adding to and taking from what Christ has commanded—of the assumption of the right in a body calling itself a Church of Christ, has but faintly impressed the minds of professedly religious men. Even Calvin could calmly endorse this most heinous sin of the mother of all the abominations of the earth—when he says, “the Church has reserved to herself the right preserving the

substance, to have rites somewhat different," etc., and in his own language respecting the change of the act from immersion to sprinkling in cold countries, "*sed id pro regionum diversitate ecclesiis librum esse debet*," but this privilege ought to be granted to the churches on account of the difference of countries. Inst. Lib. iv. chap. xv. 19.

This assumed right of a church or its rulers to change the rites that Christ has instituted and commanded, is the *very essence of Popery*. Grant it in one thing, however trivial, and you establish a principle that embraces all things. The right to change the least thing involves the right to change all—to ABOLISH ALL, and institute other and different things for them. The right to add one thing, however small, concedes the right to add all things that the Romish Apostacy has added to corrupt and destroy the Church. This right which is the marked characteristic of Antichrist, the Methodist Episcopal Society or General Conference openly claims to itself in the very articles of its religion, and has constantly exercised it, and by so doing, forfeited every claim to be considered a Scriptural Church. The whole Book of Discipline is a Statute Book, changed every four years since 1784, and yet with all its changes binding upon every member of this Society here in Carrollton, and unless implicit obedience is rendered, expulsion is ordered and must follow. If its teachings are not assented to by the most pious Christians in the Society here, if he presumes to speak against them he is to be excluded from the Supper and from the Society. The very things to which he conscientiously objects this year, and for which he is excluded, may next year be struck out of the Discipline like the Popish confessional—the Band meetings have been since the Iron Wheel was written, the class meeting test, and forty other things, yet he was cast out of Christ's Church if indeed the local Methodist Episcopal Society here be a church, not for disobeying Christ, his Savior—no, he has been in all things a dutiful child to Him, and kept all His commandments, but because he has not obeyed men and *their* commandments and traditions!

To prove to you that I am correct, I will take the law for Class-meeting now abolished. In every Discipline before a book was written (1855) styled the Great Iron Wheel, under chap. v, § 3, you will find a law for excluding every one who refused to attend Class-meeting and submit to a personal examination by a leader in whom perhaps the member had no confidence; and it was provided that the leader should give him a certificate that he was otherwise blameless as a Christian. Now was the Class-meeting a divine institution? It

originated with one Capt. Foy, for the purpose of collecting quarterage. Mr. Inskip says:

"Class-meetings are peculiar to Methodism. Other churches have occasioned inquiry, conference, or experience meetings. But class-meetings are an **ESSENTIAL PART OF OUR SYSTEM**. It is not claimed that this institution is of divine origin. So soon as we become willing to dispense with this feature of our system, our decline and downfall will certainly and rapidly follow. This is one of the ancient landmarks, and it would be almost sacrilegious to remove or deface it."—Methodism, by Inskip, pp. 192-193.

Dr. N. Bond, when discussing with the Reformers, says:

"But if the Reformers insist upon changing the rule which makes it obligatory upon our members to meet in class, because there is no positive scriptural command for it, **THEY MUST ALSO GIVE UP INFANT BAPTISM, and the administration of the communion to females, FOR THERE IS NO SUCH COMMANDMENT FOR EITHER THE ONE OR THE OTHER.**"—Economy of Methodism, p. 52.

Now this law was abolished after the appearance of the book I have mentioned and it is no longer a sin to "inveigh against it." There was a day since 1856, that it was a sin worthy of expulsion to inveigh against and violate the Class-meeting law, and before the sun went down it was no sin! Now I say to have obeyed that law was always to obey men, not Christ, and I stand here and say that to obey any law or observe any rite in this Discipline not found in the New Testament, is to obey men, and I further affirm that to obey the General Conference in anything and to take its Statute Book instead of, or along with the only law book and Discipline that Christ has given his Church, is to reject Christ as supreme and only lawgiver and to obey men, and I remember here the words of the Holy Spirit, "know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants (*douloi slaves*) ye are whom ye obey?"

Elder Ditzler has twice on bended knee sworn before God and men that he would OBEY his CHIEF ministers to whom he admitted the charge and government over him was committed, once when he was made a Deacon and again when he was made an Elder—and those oaths are this day on his soul, and the Holy Spirit says he is the slave of men. Now that obedience was not sworn in the Church of Christ, nor to any one that was or is today a member of a Gospel or Christian Church, if the M. E. Society here in Carrollton is indeed a Scriptural Church, for those chief ministers were not, and are not members of this Society here nor a Society like this anywhere! But I object further—

That the Hierarchical or Episcopal feature of—not the local M. E. Society in Carrollton for it is possessed of no government inherently, the power that controls it is in the wheel

above it, and beyond *its* control—the Methodist system which is called “Church” as unscriptural and in contravention of the teachings of Christ.

BECAUSE IT DESTROYS THE PARITY OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY, ESTABLISHING AS IT DOES THREE ORDERS OF THE MINISTRY, SUPERIOR AND INFERIOR—HAVING DIFFERENT POWERS, AND THE SUPERIOR HAVING THE CHARGE OVER THE INFERIOR.

The New Testament knows and warrants no such orders. From it we learn:

Officers and their rank and duties.—There are but two officers in the Church of Christ—pastors (elders or bishops), and deacons.

Pastors or bishops are of the same order or rank, and exercise equal authority. It is their office to teach, and take the oversight of the Church in all things pertaining to doctrine and discipline, according to the inspired word.

They must be men irreproachable in their private and public relations in life.

It is the duty of the deacons, of whom there may be seven, to take charge of all the temporalities of the Church.

In his works, vol. vii. p. 311, he says: “Lord King’s account of the Primitive Church convinced me many years ago, that bishops and presbyters are the SAME ORDER, and consequently have the same right to ordain.” This is a full and frank confession, and if his convictions are correct, the claims of a Methodist or Episcopal bishop are unscriptural and most arrogant! Did Mr. Wesley ordain an Episcopal bishop, with this conviction?

See also his Notes on the Gospel, written at the close of his life:

Acts i. 20. And his “bishopric,” he renders apostleship. In *Philippians* i. 1. In his notes on bishops, he says, “The word bishops here includes all the presbyters at Philippi, as well as the ruling presbyters; the names bishop and presbyter, or elder, being promiscuously used in the first ages!! Did Mr. Wesley, in the face of this, solemnly ordain Mr. Coke an Episcopal bishop, an order of ministry he believed neither found in, nor warranted by, God’s word?”

“But that it (Episcopacy) is prescribed in scripture, I do not believe. This opinion, which I once zealously espoused, I have been ashamed of ever since I read Bishop Stillingfleet’s ‘Irenicon.’ I think he has unanswerably proved that ‘neither Christ nor his apostles prescribe any particular form of Church government; and that the plea of divine right for diocesan Episcopacy was never heard of in the primitive Church.’”—Wesley’s Works, vol. 7.”

When Mr. Wesley learned that Mr. Asbury and Coke had established an Episcopal form of government in the United States, he addressed Mr. A. the following very pointed letter. (See Wesley’s Works, vol. vii. page 187 Letter to Asbury):

“LONDON, Sept. 20th, 1788.

“There is, indeed, a wide difference between the relation wherein you stand to the Americans, and the relation wherein I stand to all the Methodists. You are the elder brother of the American Methodists; I am, under God, the father of the whole family. (Will Methodists deny that John Wesley was their father, and are they not then his children and followers?) Therefore, I naturally care for you all, in a manner no other person can do. Therefore, I in a measure, provide for you all; for the supplies which Dr. Coke provides for you, he could not provide were it not for me—were it not, that I not only permit him to collect, but also support him in so doing.

"But in one point, my dear brother, I am a little afraid the Doctor and you differ from me. I study to be little, you study to be great; I creep, you strut along. I found a school, you a college. Nay, and call it after your own names! O, beware! Do not seek to be something! Let me be nothing, and Christ be all in all.

"One instance of this, of your greatness, has given me great concern. How can you, how dare you suffer yourself to be called a bishop? I shudder, I start at the very thought. Men may call me a knave, or a fool, a rascal, a scoundrel, and I am content; but they shall never, by my consent, call me a bishop! For my sake, for God's sake, for Christ's sake, put a full end to this! Let the Presbyterians do what they please, but let the Methodists know their calling better.

"Thus, my dear Franky, I have told you all that is in my heart, and let this, when I am no more seen, bear witness how sincerely I am your affectionate friend and brother,

"JOHN WESLEY."

Can a friend of Wesley believe that he preferred the Episcopal form of government, and yet looked upon its chief order, which makes it Episcopal, in such a light? Can any Methodist who does not regard Mr. Wesley as a double-dealer, believe that he ordained Mr. Coke an Episcopal bishop, and directed him to ordain Mr. Asbury, and because they allowed themselves to be so called, chastise them in such language as the above; language which, in these days of equality, a Christian man would scorn to use or receive?

I submit the testimony of Dr. Mosheim as to the polity of the Apostolic churches:

"When we look back to the commencement of the Christian church, we find its government administered jointly by the pastors and the people. But in the process of time, the scene changes, and we see these pastors affecting an air of pre-eminence and superiority, trampling upon the rights and privileges of the community and assuming to themselves a supreme authority both in civil and religious matters. This invasion of the rights of the people was at length carried to such a height, that a single man administered, or at least pretended a right to administer, the affairs of the whole church with an unlimited sway."

"If, however, it is true that the Apostles acted by divine inspiration and in conformity with the commands of their blessed Master, (and this no Christian can call in question,) then it follows, that that form of government which the primitive churches borrowed from that of Jerusalem, the first Christian assembly established by the Apostles themselves, must be esteemed as Divine institution. * * * * In those early times every Christian church consisted of the people, their leaders, [pastors] and the ministers or deacons, and these indeed belong essentially to every religious society."

"It was therefore the assembly of the people which chose their own rulers and teachers, or received them, by a free and authoritative consent when recommended by others. The same people rejected or confirmed, by their suffrages, the laws that were proposed by their rulers to the assembly; excommunicated profligate and unworthy members of the church, restored the penitent to their forfeited privileges, passed judgment upon the different subjects of controversy and dissension that arose in their community, examined and decided the disputes which happened between the elders and deacons, and, in a word, exercised all that authority which belongs to such as are invested with the sovereign power."

"The rulers of the church were called either presbyters, or bishops, which two titles are, in the New Testament, undoubtedly applied to the same order of men. These were persons of eminent gravity, and such as had distinguished themselves by their superior sanctity or merit. Their particular functions were not always the same; for while some of them

confined their labors to the instruction of the people, others contributed in different ways to the edification of the church. Hence the distinction between teaching and ruling presbyters has been adopted by certain learned men. But, if ever this distinction existed, which I neither affirm or deny, it certainly did not continue long; since it is manifest, that St. PAUL requires that all bishops or presbyters be qualified and ready to teach and instruct.

"Let none, however confound the bishops of this primitive and golden period of the church with those of whom we read in the following ages. For, though they were both distinguished by the same name, yet they differed extremely, and that in many respects. A bishop, during the first and second century, was a person who had the care of one Christian assembly, which, at that time, was, generally speaking, small enough to be contained in a private house. In this assembly he acted not so much with the authority of a master, as with the zeal and diligence of a faithful servant.

"The churches, in those early times, were entirely independent; none of them subject to any foreign jurisdiction, but each one governed by its own rules, and its own laws. For though the churches founded by the Apostles, had this particular deference shown them, that they were consulted in difficult and doubtful cases, yet they had no juridical authority, no sort of supremacy over the others, nor the least right to enact laws for them."—[*Time out.*

DR. DITZLER'S SIXTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS :—We are now told about church division—the great separation of 1844, etc., as if it had any thing to do with our Proposition. Suppose all that were true, it affects not our question in the least. It is dragged in solely as so much is brought in on each Proposition, to kill or fill up time—not for argument surely. But—

1. Our people were consulted—the vote taken in every congregation on the border. A full and regular vote was had of the entire laity that would attend. Some congregations in Kentucky and all in Maryland, a number in Virginia, adhered North, with the Methodist Episcopal Church, while one in Cincinnati adhered South. Hence his assertion is not correct.

2. Did they allow a full vote when (1) they seceded from The General Baptists, then (2) from the *bona fide* Calvinistic Baptists, etc., etc?

3. Did the Apostolic church do as he asks, or the representatives do it? We have seen *they* did the work.

He now tells us about what Cardinal Honorius—the bitterest of enemies to Protestants—says, and I quote Dr. Graves' words on the main points. He says that Honorius says the Pope and Bishops were all equal, all on an equality till A. D. 594! They were all equal till John of Constantinople “became Patriarch.” Any authority of a bishop over any other than one church “was never known before.” “There never was a bishop before (John) who usurped or held place over any other.” It “never was claimed before him.”

I confess to you all, these statements of Dr. Graves simply amaze a man who knows what history is. They are simply astounding. He goes on to tell us they “offered that very title to Boniface, A. D. 606 there, the first Pope that ever sat on a throne, etc.,” at Rome. He says you “can't find it [popery] back of that time.” The church in these matters “remained unaltered 300 or 400 years!!” He says Giesler the greatest of all historians tells us so!

Now sirs, we have a chance very fully to test matters. Here is an issue. It is clearly a pet idea with the Doctor too, for he made some of these assertions in his hours' opening speech on Mode of Baptism. We paid no attention to the matter then, because it was all foreign to the Proposition then under

discussion. We have administered rebukes, animadverted on the way Baptists treat history and authors, and Dr. Graves has complained of it bitterly. Now let us look into the facts. Giesler is quoted—he is the most accurate of all historians, and gives you in all cases, of any importance, all the documents—the *original* documents that support and justify his declarations. On the contrary, you will see that Dr. Graves' statements are simply preposterous. Why, already the Roman Empire had fallen, before 594, by over one hundred years, viz., 476.

Long since the seat of empire was removed to the East. It was this that enabled the Roman Bishops to enlarge their powers so fearfully, because, in the absence of the government, and the influence of the Bishop of Rome, many secular rights and the distribution of large sums of money were given to him. In this way orphans, protection and care of widows, etc., were left to him. The incursions of the Heruli, Goths, Saracens, all induced many to look to the Bishop of Rome for protection, as, the church and clergy were not molested.

But the appeal is to a standard—the highest of all—historian, we hold him in our hand, and will read.

The quotation Dr. Graves makes from Giesler and the assertions he makes of the times designated are in vol. i. p. 236 to 239 of his *Ecclesiastical History*. Now Geisler—and Hase, Mosheim, Neander, Bingham all say the same in substance—show and declare that “in the East” the West, was not, *i. e.*, the Roman church (“Rome”) was not allowed a superior claim, but all bishops in the East were equal to those of the West. “In the West, it is true, Rome was elevated to be the ecclesiastical metropolis of a great part of Italy,” and shows that in some parts “such hierarchical associations” had not obtained 236. “Metropolitans” long since existed. He says also, “The Bishops of the three great cities of the Roman Empire, Rome, Alexandria and Antioch, had, at the same time, the largest dioceses. Hence, they were regarded as the principal bishops of christendom. Still, however, at this time, * * all bishops were perfectly alike in dignity and power etc.” He then adds that much less did they “believe in the superior authority of the Romish bishop.” He tells of the “general duties toward the whole church in addition to those peculiar duties they owed to their respective dioceses.” p. 239 Cypriani Epis. 67. This as early as 251–3, A. D. In those times he tells us of the “enlargement of their dioceses and the clergy subject to them.” (241) of “Provincial bishops,” their “influence on the choice of a bishop,” and the “bishop nominated the inferior clergy.” 247.

At the beginning of the fourth century, "The bishop of Rome stood preeminent above all his brethren at the very commencement of this period." 377 Archbishops, Patriarchs already exist in the full sense of those words *exarchos Archiepiscopus patriarchos*. "In Egypt the bishop of Alexandria had almost monarchical power." We have a "reigning Patriarch," etc., 374 and 373. Patriarchs in the East, viz: of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem—four.

Leo fully developed "the idea of Peter's primacy," p. 388. Leo first—A. D. 440-461, tried at the Chalcedon Council to have "himself regarded as head of the whole church." p. 395.

Such are only a few of the many facts that utterly crush Dr. Graves' astonishing assertions on bishops, on the church in all leading matters. It is in this way they treat history and make such astonishing assertions not only in the absence of all support or fact, but where all the facts flatly contradict and expose the declarations *in toto*.

It shows you, too, what little respect that class of Roman authors, such as Honorius, and Baronius are entitled to when treating on any method of history that relates to Protestants. They always have an eye to our injury in all they say, and act accordingly. We *never* rely on them in any such case.

After such blunders as these, so bold, so reckless, you will know how to appreciate his assertion, that we have no church but in General Conference. That the laity have no voice in our General Conference or church. We have the laity in ALL our Councils or Conferences. A Steward's meeting is nearly all laymen, and the preacher has no vote in the most important issues. In a Quarterly Conference, a large majority are laymen. A district Conference is not legislative in any sense, and we have a large proportion of laymen there. In an Annual Conference it is the same way. In no case can a traveling preacher vote when those laymen are elected. Laymen elect laymen. No one can be a preacher in our church till first elected by laymen. The General Conference is our legislative body. It is composed of equal numbers of laymen and ministers, with equal votes. A Bishop has no vote there, yet any layman, of a proper age, elected wholly by laymen, has. Now sir, these are the facts. How do they harmonize with what you have been asserting.

He says it takes all our local churches to make one church. Were not all God's Churches in Paul's day called "one body," called "*the Church of God*?"—called "one bread?" I Cor. x. 17; xii. 12, 13; Col. i. 18, 25, etc. Are not all your Baptist churches called "*the Baptist Church*"—thus spoken of as one?"

He says one letter from a Bishop would send one of us all hither or thither. We have our Bishops under well-defined law, and we—laymen and ministers—can stop, suspend, try, expel him from office. Let a Bishop violate our laws, or the spirit and intent thereof, and very quickly will he be brought to account for it. But in your church a mob, unchecked by law, can ride rough-shod over a helpless minority and they have no redress whatever. A minister's or member's character may be crushed out, or bespattered with infamy, yet he, innocent, but denied redress. You talk of a Republican form—a Democratic form of church government—you are just the reverse. A Republican form of government is a government of well defined rights, laws, and officers to execute the laws under legal restraint—in well defined ways. Nothing of the kind have you. A Republican form of Government allows the legal majority to make the laws—elect officers. Then these execute the laws by processes well-defined. Nothing of the kind have you. Yours is not a Democracy—not a government of laws by the people, but a *mobocracy* simple and pure.

He says a conference can take property away, etc. Here again he is lame. It has laws to regulate all such matters, and parties known in law, to protect property. When these chose, they can sell the property under direction from a quarterly conference of layman. But your church is such an airy nothing, that in law the finest legal telescope cannot see you or your laws. You dissolve into thin mist. Hence law suits in congregational churches, like serious trials, are burlesques.

He at last ventures to attack a little item of doctrine, held by all great divines, that we are to be reconciled not only to God, but God reconciled to us. We quote only one text. Christ gives it, puts in the mouth of a penitent sinner, "God be merciful;" the Greek is, "God be RECONCILED to me a sinner!" "Can two walk together except they be agreed?"—reconciled? You see that all, all fails.

He talks about what a sacrament is and fain would impress you that it is some Romish idea of monstrous iniquity. How does Webster define it? "A sacred ceremony used to bind or impress an obligation." That is, we are pledged to live Christian lives, have taken on us the vows of the Almighty. Now the Lord's Supper is done in remembrance of him to whom we have pledged our lives' devotion, and so is used by so reminding us of Christ's death till he come again; "to bind or impress" this obligation. And that is something terrible is it? What next, Doctor?

The Doctor has constantly tried to make it appear that we

were quite Romish in our church. We have seen how utterly he has failed. Has he thought of his own? We saw that his church is committed to infallibility. That is a very important article. They hold absolutely to the position that water Baptism is an initiatory rite into Christ's Kingdom. Is there salvation out of that Kingdom? That is purely Romish. Rome holds that they are *the* church, and there is no other body which can claim to be a church. Baptists do the same. Rome claims apostolic succession. So do these Baptists. Rome holds that only one in the succession can rightly administer the ordinances. So does Dr. Graves and his successionists. How will that do for a specimen of Romanism?

We now call your especial attention to the following. By Baptist rules—according to Baptist principles there is no Church of God.

1. They demand there be shown an organized, established church. They found no such process of organization. Dr. Graves went to the Mount—it was not there. He found no other place where he could dare locate it, so he lets it go.

2. They demand succession in order to church existence. No such succession can be traced. It does not exist. Hence by their principles there is no church—never can be.

3. Without water baptism as the initiatory rite, no one can get into the church. No one was baptized on the Mount where he locates its organization, so to be consistent, there exists no church.

4. Without “specific forms” of law, a model to go by, a “system of laws of Government,” there can be no church, by Dr. Grave’s position. None such existed—were made on the Mount, and he finds no organization later to start from, so we have no church at all.

5. Unless five things hold good in every case, the party is not baptized, it is not baptism, and so he is not a member of the church. In no case of baptism since John and the Apostles, did all five of these conditions, or four of these conditions hold good. Hence there is no church, and never can be on earth.

Now we appeal to this audience, did you not expect so able and so practiced a man to be able to make some show at least on a question of their own seeking? They demanded this question. It was unpleasant and distasteful to all our people, because the very idea of the putting into discussion the question of the existence of a people’s church, the church that settled the West; that led the banner of civilization on; that met the dangers of the bloody tomahawk, the dagger and the arrow; that surmounted all obstacles, and planted the ban-

ner of Emanuel in all these prairies—to start a proposition that asked whether she was a church or not, was an insult and affront. We have hurled it back upon them. To-day our record is on high. We have sent our most gifted men, our finest orators, our most accomplished scholars, our purest men into the ever expanding West.

We have planted the banner on every hill, on every prairie, in every hut. We led you, and our cause inspired you. Your success has been under the broad ægis of our presence. You stopped to quarrel with us by the way. We begged for peace. You grew defiant. We insisted for peace for the Gospel's sake. You grew aggressive. We turned out of your way and sought peace. You grew insolent and slapped us in the face. Then we throttled you! And now we are in dead earnest. We have all the facts. We have all the right on our side. We have the truth with us—the Bible of God. Have you observed how he has paraded in every proposition what some old time Encyclopædiæ said; what this old Annotator thought, and the other reviewer guessed. He has thrown out a huge drag-net and pulled to shore out of the deep sea of oblivion a mass of old trash of which the writers were long since ashamed and heart-sick—he has dragged it out and held it up before you. What was our course? Here was our text book—here is our foundation—this grand old Bible. He quotes Deems, when he was mad. We quoted the Bible. He quoted Bascom when he was vexed and tortured into bitterness. We quoted the Bible. He quoted Jesse Lee when he was out of temper and furious. We turned to the Bible. When he came to a history, he guessed at three fourths, and missed every time, and fell back on a bitter and hateful enemy of the Reformation—Cardinal Honorius. We quoted the very great historian Dr. Graves introduced. On Methodist history he relied on assertion and the embittered sayings of our enemies. We took standard Baptist historians exclusively—men selected and endorsed by the Baptists of the United States. How different our courses in all these things. Hence our position has never been seriously assaulted. Special pleading was and is his hope. All our points were made out, perfectly supported, and will stand forever.—[*Time out.*

DR. GRAVES' SIXTH REPLY

MR. PRESIDENT:—If my opponent can afford to leave the defence of his Society, and spend his time upon matters foreign to this question—I have no time to follow him. I once more, with all the emphasis of our language, ask him to meet and answer me these questions—which correctly answered, settle this question.

1. Do you claim to be a member of any visible Church on earth? If you do, then, 2, Is your membership in any local M. E. Society like this in Carrollton? or is the membership of any traveling preacher, or of any Bishop, in a local society, like this, or only in an Annual Conference, which is confessedly no church at all! And once more. Do you endorse the definition of Church, given in the XIII. Art. of your Discipline? While he is deciding whether to answer, and how to answer these, I will push rapidly forward my objections in refutation of this proposition.

I have said that in this is the very essence of the papacy, and I now say that Pope is but Bishop written large. Let me refer you to a historical fact. Before the year 594 no man had ever claimed or worn the title or exercised the authority of Pope *i. e.* Universal Pontiff. Prior to this time every Bishop was called *papa*, in English, Father. In this year John, Bishop of Constantinople, sought the supremacy and assumed the title of Universal Bishop—"chief minister" of all. Gregory, the then Bishop and called Pope of Rome, addressed to his brother John a letter, which Cardinal Baronius has preserved. In that epistle he rebukes his arrogance and sin in these forcible words, which I commend to your chief ministers.

"Gregory, to John, Bishop of Constantinople.—Let your holiness acknowledge, that '*Discipulis Dominus dicit, autem nolite vocari rabbi, unus enim Magister vester est, vos omnes fratres estis,*' &c. 'Our Lord says to his disciples, 'Be not ye called rabbi, for one is your Master, and all ye are brethren.' What therefore, most dear brother, are you, in the terrible examination of the coming Judge, to say, who, *generalis pater in mundo vocari appetis?* desire to be called, not father, only, but the general father of the world?"

"Beware of the sinful suggestions of the wicked. Offences must indeed come, but wo to that man by whom the offence cometh. Behold, the church is rent by this wicked world of pride; the hearts of the brethren are offended. Have you forgotten what truth saith? 'Whoso offendeth one of these little ones who believes in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he plunged into the depth of the sea.

"I beg, I entreat, and I beseech, with all possible suavity that your brotherhood resist all these flatterers who offer you this name of error, and that you refuse to be designated by so foolish and so proud an appellation.

"*Perpende, rogo, quia in hac presumptione pax totius turbatur ecclesiæ,*" &c. "Consider, I entreat you, that by this rash presumption is the peace of the whole church disturbed, and the grace poured out in common upon all contradicted: in which you can increase only in proportion as you carefully decrease in self-esteem, and become the greater the more you restrain yourself from this name of proud and foolish usurpation.

"Were not, as your brotherhood knows, my predecessors in this apostolical see, which I now serve by God's providence, called by the council of Chalcedon to this offered honour? but none of them would ever allow himself to be named by such a title—none snatched at this rash name, lest if he should seize on this singular glory of the pontificate, he should seem to deny it to all his brethren.

"*Sed omnia quæ prædicta sunt, fiunt: rex superbiæ prope est et quod dici nefas est, sacerdotum est preparatus exitus (vel exercitus ei), qui cervice militant clationis.*" "But all things which are foretold are come to pass; the king of pride approaches, and O, horrid to tell! the going forth of (or the army of the priests) is ready for him, who fight with the neck of pride, though appointed to lead to humility." Lib. 4, ep. 38.

Gregory also addressed a letter to the Emperor Mauritius and the Empress, from which I will read one sentence.

"To the Emperor Mauritius and the Empress.—'Now this brother by a PRESUMPTION NEVER BEFORE KNOWN, contrary to the precepts of the gospel, and to the decrees of the canons, usurping a new name, glorying in new and profane titles, which blasphemy be far from every Christian heart, would be called universal bishop; but in this his pride what doth he but show the time of antichrist approaches, because he imitates him who, despising his brother angels, would rise to a height peculiar to himself, that he might be subject to none. When he who is called universal falls, the church that hath consented to that profane name hath rushed headlong from its state; but far be that blasphemous name from the hearts of Christians. To consent to that wicked word universal is nothing else but to destroy the faith.' " Lib. 4, ep. 38.

Then, according to Pope Gregory, it was antichristian, blasphemous, and diabolical for any bishop to assume the title supreme head, and heresy and a losing of the FAITH for any one to acknowledge it, and that all should strive against it to death. Hence, from this pope's testimony, it is pretty evident that St. Peter had nothing to do with it. Yet in a few years, in 606, his own successor, Boniface III., by the aid of the Emperor Phocas,* took this very title, which Gregory called execrable. Thus has a Pope of Rome, with great point and accuracy, more than twelve hundred years ago, marked the distinct character of the man of sin, the son of perdition, as being a Christian bishop with an army of inferior ministers or priests, taking to him in his pride the title universal or sovereign pontiff; that is, antichrist, and an Episcopal bishop of the Third Order is none the less so!!!

This will interest many as to the origin and the exact date of the birth of the first Roman Pontiff—the birth of the Romish Catholic Church begotten by command of Phocas A. D.

* "Phocas iratus Ciriaco Episcopo Constantinopolitano adjudicavit titulum (*Ecumenici Pontifici* Romano soli."—Baronius, An. A. C. 606. "Phocas, being incensed against Ciriacus Bishop, of Constantinople, who had assumed the title, granted the title *sovereign pontiff* to the Roman bishop."

606, and born as the seven headed and ten horned beast of Revelation A. D. 610, to continue 1260 years, as a civil and temporal power, and consequently expired January 1st, 1870, from which hour the Papacy has had no power to put to death, punish with sword, or hurt the bodies of its people. But I have sometimes thought that Methodism may possibly be symbolized by the two horned beast, that came up out of the earth, having the face and horns of a lamb, but speaking like a dragon.

But I urge as a fundamental and vital objection to this local M. E. Society and the whole system of Methodism, of which it is a part—being a Church of Christ, or any branch of it.

VI. BECAUSE ITS DOCTRINES, AS SET FORTH IN ITS DISCIPLINE IN THE WORKS OF WESLEY, AND ITS STANDARD PUBLICATIONS, ARE BOTH UNSCRIPTURAL AND SUBVERSIVE OF CHRIST'S CHURCH, AND OF CHRISTIANITY, AND PUT IN PERIL THE SOULS OF ALL WHO BELIEVE THEM.

The first question is, where are we to learn what the doctrines of the M. E. "Church" are—the doctrines that this local M. E. Society in Carrollton must hold and teach, and what every member, whether an exhorter, Deacon, Elder, Presiding Elder, or Bishop has solemnly obligated himself to hold and teach.

If you will refer to the Manual I hold in my hands, put forth by Bishop McTyeire, at the request of, and endorsed by the General Conference, you will learn that it is not only from the articles of religion and discipline, but from all the standard theological books published by the Book Concern, Adam Clarke, R. Watson, but Wesley's Works in particular and even the Methodist hymn book.

Now observe it matters not a hair's weight what Elder Ditzler may say *he* does or does not believe touching this or that doctrine, but what is the doctrine of his church, as set forth in these works. If he affirms that he does not believe them, but stands before you and opposes them, then it is clear unless he has obtained from his Conference and chief minister, his ecclesiastical masters, a "dispensation"—an indulgence of some sort, absolving him from the force of his oath, he stands before you in the light of a minister, who has sworn to believe, to hold, and to teach, and which, by his priestly ministrations and religious examples, he does teach what he at heart does not believe, but publicly opposes! And if he, to excite your prejudices, should put up the cry of persecution, because I develop the unscriptural doctrines contained in these standards, you know it will be both dishonorable and cowardly.

I open the Discipline and read Article II:

The Son, who is the Word of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin; so that two whole and perfect natures—that is to say, the Godhead and manhood—were joined together in one person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men.—Meth. Dis. Art. ii, p. 10.

This teaches that the second person in the Trinity, took upon or united with himself a perfect man, having human soul as well as body—in the act of incarnation, and that this perfect man was so joined to him as never to be divided, and therefore the second person in Heaven to-day is a *duality*, a compound being, a man and a God, and is called Christ, and this being is and will be the object of worship forever! A perfect human being is thus apotheosized and idolized! The Papists have incorporated Mary, a perfect woman, with the Godhead, making four persons, and Methodists thus incorporated a perfect man with the Trinity, and if the former is obnoxious to the charge of idolatry, I see not why the latter is not. I would as soon worship a perfect woman as a perfect man.

That Christ suffered and died “to reconcile the Father to us,” is quite as crude to my mind, as Elder Ditzler's teaching that the Covenant of Redemption was made with Abraham, and Christ became surety to Abraham that His Father would fulfill his part of the covenant. The Sacred Scriptures teach that.

All things are of God, who hath reconciled to us himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to-wit, That God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation.

I open to Article xvi, and read:—

Sacraments, ordained of Christ, are not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they are certain signs of grace, and God's good will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him.

There are two sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the gospel; that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord.”

From this I learn, 1. That both baptism and the Lord's Supper are “sacraments.” This is a theological term and signifies a rite that not only creates or brings into special and spiritual relations to Christ, but ratifies them also—universally among Ritualists, it is used to denote a “means of grace,” of converting, regenerating, justifying or confirming grace. In this article it is said to be a rite, by the which God doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen our faith in him. The first work accomplished by

the Holy Spirit upon a sinner dead in sins, is to quicken him, and so enable him to exercise faith, etc. Baptism, then, according to this article, is held and taught as the appointed means of regeneration, so that we may not expect the effect without the means.

Wesley thus explains a sacrament.

"The parts of a sacrament are two: the one, an outward and sensible sign; the other an inward and spiritual grace, thereby signified."

I open the Ritual, for the baptism of infants, and read:

"Dearly beloved, forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin, and that our Savior Christ saith, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

I understand this to teach from the context, and from the explanation Wesley gives us, that no one can enter heaven or be saved without baptism. Wesley explains this in his Treatise on Baptism.

"By baptism, we who were 'by nature children of wrath,' are made the children of God. And this regeneration which our Church in so many places ascribes to baptism is more than barely being admitted into the Church, though commonly connected therewith; being 'grafted into the body of Christ's Church, *we are made the children of God by adoption and grace.*' This is grounded on the plain words of our Lord, 'Except a man be born again of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God,' John iii. 5. *By water then, as a means, the water of baptism, we are regenerated or born again;* whence it is also called by the Apostle, 'the washing of regeneration.' Our Church therefore ascribes no greater virtue to baptism than Christ himself has done. Nor does she ascribe it to the outward washing, but to the inward grace, which, added thereto, makes it a sacrament. Herein a principle of grace is infused, which will not be wholly taken away, unless we quench the Holy Spirit of God by long continued wickedness."—Wesley's Works, Vol. vi. p. 15, Sec. 4.

I now read the rest of the exhortation:

"I beseech you to call upon God the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that of his bounteous mercy he will grant to this child that which by nature he cannot have: that he may be baptized with water and the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ's holy Church, and made a lively member of the same."

I understand from this that the infant is recognized as a *depraved* being, *dead* to spiritual things, and that God is besought to confer on it, in and by the act of baptism, three things; (1), regeneration of heart, (2), quicken and make it alive from the dead, (3), receive it into the church visible. Elder Ditzler says invisible, then of course the prayer is to regenerate and sanctify it, for no unregenerate infant or adult was ever a member of that ideal church in the estimation of any one!

I now read the first prayer:

"Almighty and everlasting God, we beseech thee for thine infinite mercies, that thou wilt look upon this child: wash him and sanctify him with the Holy Ghost; that he, being delivered from thy wrath, may be received into the ark of Christ's Church."

This certainly teaches three things. (1.) That every infant

baptized by this office is regarded, not as an innocent being, as Eld. Ditzler teaches, but a depraved sinner, since it is under the wrath of God, from which the Methodist ministers pray that infants may be delivered. (2). In the act of baptism, as the means the infant may be washed and sanctified by the Holy Spirit. (3). That by the act it is received into Christ's Church, and made a member of the same. If more proof of this is wanted, I will read two more petitions :

"O merciful God, grant that the old Adam in *this child* may be so buried that the new man may be raised up in *him*. *Amen.*"

"Grant that all carnal affections may die in *him*, and that all things belonging to the Spirit may live and grow in *him*. *Amen.*"

"Grant that whosoever is dedicated to thee by our office and ministry may also be endued with heavenly virtues, and everlastingly rewarded through thy mercy, O blessed Lord God."

"Regard, we beseech thee, the supplications of thy congregation; and grant that *this child*, now to be baptized, may receive the fullness of thy grace, and ever remain in the number of thy faithful and elect children, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*"

It is evident that the Church that first used this Ritual as a general practice, immersed its members, infants as well as adults. These petitions most certainly teach that the carnal nature, with its affections, can be and are destroyed in the act of baptism, and that the unconscious infant can be, by the act, endued with "heavenly virtues, and in the act "receive the fullness of God's grace," and be introduced—for they could not remain where they were not placed—into the number of God's faithful and *elect* children," and such are never lost. So admits Dr. Bledsoe in his Art. on the Salvation of God's Elect. Now to be certain that I do not misinterpret the Ritual, when I say it teaches that baptism is recognized in it as the means of grace and salvation to the infant; so, that without it, there is no promise of heaven to it, I will turn to the explanation of this Ritual, and of the doctrine of baptism as held by this Society in Carrollton, and Methodists North and South, by the man who prepared it for his Church, John Wesley. His writings and views are endorsed as the standard doctrines of the M. E. Church.

I will quote from a book titled "Doctrinal Tracts" issued by the Methodist Book Concern, North, and the edition issued prior to 1861. I do this for special reasons.

1. Many of these extracts which I shall read have been quoted by me in the paper I edit, *The Baptist*, and used by our ministers when objecting to the doctrines of Methodists, and since 1861 the leaders have taught their people to deny that they were in the "Doctrinal Tracts," and are wont to produce the issues since 1861 to prove it. I shall therefore read from the unchanged edition and let Elder Ditzler here deny that

what I read was ever in the Doctrinal Tracts; and if he does not, his silence will disprove the statements of thousands of his people concerning this matter. I read from the Doctrinal Tracts because Eld. Ditzler has published all over the Southwest, and openly stated in this debate, (on the Lord's Supper) that Wesley never wrote this Treatise and that it was inserted in the editions prior to 1861 by mistake or under the impression that it was Wesley's.

Well, if anybody ought to know Wesley's writings and sentiments, surely the learned editors of "Wesley's Life and Works," and the editors of the works issued by the Book Concern ought. They stated in the edition of 1832, that this treatise is John Wesley's, and the Book Concern publishes it for forty-three years as John Wesley's Treatise, and of course for this length of time it is endorsed as the faith of Methodists.

In the new edition, 1861, they say they substituted another article for Mr. Wesley's treatise, thus endorsing it as Wesley's. I now open Mr. Wesley's Works, Vol. vi. p. 12, and I find this entire "Treatise" word for word! Will Eld. Ditzler now persist in saying that it is not Mr. Wesley's Work? Now what does the church through him teach, are the benefits infants, received in baptism?

"What are the benefits we receive by baptism, is the next point to be considered. (And the first of these is, the washing away the guilt of original sin, by the application of the merits of Christ's death.) That we are all born under the guilt of Adam's sin, and that all sin deserves external misery, was the unanimous sense of the ancient Church, as it is expressed in the Ninth Article of our own. And the Scripture plainly asserts that we were "shapen in iniquity, and in sin did our mother conceive us;" that "we were all by nature children of wrath, and dead in trespasses and sins;" that "in Adam all die;" that "by one man's disobedience all were made sinners;" that "by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; which came upon all men, because all had sinned." This plainly includes infants: for they too die; therefore they have sinned; but not by actual sin; therefore by original; else what need have they of the death of Christ? Yea, "death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those who had not sinned" actually "according to the similitude of Adam's transgression." This, which can relate to infants only, is a clear proof that the whole race of mankind are obnoxious both to the guilt and punishment of Adam's transgression. But "as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men, to justification of life." And the virtue of this free gift, the merits of Christ's life and death, *are applied to us in baptism.* "He gave himself for the church, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word," Eph. v. 25, 26, namely, in baptism, the ordinary instrument of our justification. Agreeably to this, our church prays in the baptismal office, that the person to be baptized may be "washed and sanctified by the Holy Ghost, and, being delivered from God's wrath, receive remission of sins, and enjoy the everlasting benediction of his heavenly washing;" and declare in the rubric at the end of the office, "It is certain, by God's word, that children who are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin are saved."—*Wesley's Works vol. vi., page 14.*

But Eld. Ditzler has maintained that infants are born "innocent," "fit for heaven," and therefore are entitled to baptism.

By baptism we are admitted into the church, and consequently made members of Christ, its head."

"In the ordinary way, there is no other means of entering into the Church or into heaven."

But Eld. Ditzler says infants are born into the church.

"By baptism, we who were "by nature children of wrath," are made the children of God." "In all ages, the outward baptism is a means of the inward; as outward circumcision was of the circumcision of the heart."—*Wesley's Works*, vol. vi. p. 15.

"As to the grounds of it—If infants are guilty of original sin, then they are proper subjects of baptism; seeing, in the ordinary way, they cannot be saved, unless this be washed away by baptism. It has been already proved, that this original stain cleaves to every child of man; and that hereby they are children of wrath, and liable to eternal damnation. It is true, the Second Adam has found a remedy for the disease which came upon all by the offence of the first. *But the benefit of this is to be received through the means which he hath appointed; through baptism in particular*, which is the ordinary means he hath appointed for that purpose; and to which God hath tied us, though he may not have tied himself. Indeed, where it cannot be had, the case is different; but extraordinary cases do not make void a standing rule. This, therefore, is our First ground. Infants need to be washed from original sin; therefore they are proper subjects of baptism"—*Wesley's Works*, vol. vi., p. 10.

"A man may possibly be "born of water," and yet not be "born of the Spirit." There may sometimes be the outward sign, where there is not the inward grace. I do not now speak with regard to infants; it is certain our church supposes, that all who are baptized in their infancy, are at the same time born again; and it is allowed that the whole office for the baptism of infants proceeds upon this supposition. Nor is it an objection of any weight against this, that we cannot comprehend how this work can be wrought in infants. For neither can we comprehend how it is wrought in a person of riper years."—*Wesley's Works*, vol. i., p. 405.

Can anyone doubt that the M. E. church holds and teaches that baptism is the means of salvation to infants, and that in the "ordinary way" none can be saved without it? and who knows of an *extraordinary* way? I will ask my opponent whose church teaches the damnation of unconscious infants? The necessity of baptism to salvation which Baptists never held, originated the idea of the necessity of infant baptism and the practice this day is continued for the self-same reasons that it confers some needed Spiritual grace or benefit or that it makes the salvation of the infant more certain at least.

I open a book here entitled "Morris' Sermons"—published by the Book concern North. The author is a Bishop of the M. E. C. (if not dead.)

"All infants need the thing which baptism represents—namely, the purification of their nature by the grace of God. To charge my congregation with denying this, would be to charge them with being Pelagians; and we will lose no time in proving now what all Christians allow to be true—the depravity of human nature."

"But if they [infants] have an interest in the covenant of grace, why deprive them of baptism, the initiating ordinance under that covenant, BEING THE TRUE CHRISTIAN CIRCUMCISION?"

"As infants were members under that Gospel covenant by circumcision, so they should be now by baptism, which Paul calls the circumcision of Christ."—*Morris' Sermons*, p. 245.

He states here that baptism is the "*true circumcision*," "the circumcision of Christ," which every Christian knows is the regeneration of the heart. Infants, he says, need this to fit them for heaven, and therefore they should be baptized because it is the only appointed means to obtain it, says Mr. Wesley.

Now let us examine the Ritual for the Baptism of adults. We find throughout, the self-same expressions as in the office for infants, and of course they mean the same thing as explained by Wesley. The whole office proceeds upon the fact that every adult baptized by the M. E. Church is a sinner unregenerate and comes to baptism to be released from his sins and to receive regeneration of heart in the act.

"Then the minister shall speak to the persons to be baptized on this wise: Well-beloved, who are come hither, desiring to receive holy baptism, ye have heard how the congregation hath prayed that our Lord Jesus Christ would vouchsafe to receive you, and bless you, TO RELEASE YOU OF YOUR SINS, to give YOU THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN, and everlasting life. And our Lord Jesus Christ hath promised in his holy word to grant all those things that we have prayed for; which promise he for his part will most surely keep and perform."—*Discipline*, p. 210.

The office does not recognize or admit the idea that they are already Christians saved, pardoned, or regenerate, or can be without baptism. There is no ceremony or prayer for the baptism of a believer, of a recognized regenerate person, in the Discipline! Therefore Christian Baptism is unknown in the M. E. Church. Every one baptized by Methodist ministers must be baptized as a confessedly unregenerate sinner, to receive the grace of remission, regeneration and salvation! I refer you to Wesley's explanation of its nature and benefits.

I now open the Hymn Books of the two Divisions of Methodism, and examine the Hymns on Baptism. In the Northern Book, besides the Invocation, there are nine hymns—eight are for infants, and one that may be used for infants or adults, but each teach the self-same doctrine—baptismal efficacy, spiritual regeneration effected by baptism as a sacrament!—that it is the seal that imparts and ratifies the benefits of the covenant of grace. I will give you one, found in both, No. 280.

Father, in these reveal thy Son;
In these, for whom we seek thy face.
The *hidden mystery* make known,
The inward, pure, baptizing-grace.

Jesus, with us thou always art;
Effectual make the sacred sign;
The *gift unspeakable* impart,
And bless the ordinance divine.

Eternal Spirit, from on high,
 Baptizer of our spirits thou,
 The sacramental seal apply,
 And witness with the water now."

Thus have we seen that the statement of Mr. Wesley is true, that the whole office for baptism in the M. E. Society, proceeds upon the supposition that in the "ordinary way"—i. e., so far as the Scriptures reveal it, no one can be born again, unless by baptism as a means, and that it is the doctrine of the M. E. Society, that every infant is certainly born again in its baptism, and that without it in the "ordinary way." they are lost and that in the ordinary way all adults are born again in baptism—the teachings of the Ritual suppose it—though to this there may be exceptions.

These being the well known doctrines of Methodism, we can understand why they do not restrict baptism to the infants of believing parents, or to professed believers in Christ, but urge it upon all classes, young and old men, without any conditions save a professed desire "to flee the wrath to come."

We can also understand why they place pardon of sin and regeneration after baptism, and thus strike hands with Campbellites, or Disciples. I will read a paragraph here from the sermons of Bishop Morris:

11. True penitents are proper subjects of baptism.

1. Baptism is one of the means of Grace; and, therefore, suitable for penitents, who need all the help they can get. So Peter understood it, as it appears from the advice he gave those who were smitten under his preaching: "Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Here, Acts ii, 37, 38, we can but mark the difference between the system of some Calvinistic teachers, and that of the Gospel. Their system is, 1. Conversion. 2. Repentance. 3. Pardon; and lastly, baptism. But Peter's arrangement is, 1. Repentance. 2. Baptism. 3. Pardon; and, 4. The witness of the Spirit.—Morris' Sermons, p. 213.

It will not do for Elder Ditzler to storm over this matter, and charge me with attributing doctrines to his Society that I know it does not hold or teach. I have not done so. I do know that this is the teaching and practice of his church, touching baptism, and it is not the obsolete but the present doctrine and teachings of his Conferences. To further prove my assertion, I will read an article from the pen of Dr. Hendrickson, of Jackson, Tenn., that appeared in the last volume of my paper, published in the city of Memphis, and his statement has not been challenged by any Methodist *Advocate* or authority:

Professing Regeneration Before Baptism an Evil.

"We were annoyed to find the declaration in one of the official reports published by the last Memphis Conference, in the *Methodist Advocate*, of Memphis. We were so accustomed to read in the New Testament of persons professing faith or regeneration before baptism, that the evil of such a profession never occurred to us before. Then we knew that Baptists, "from the days of John the Baptist until now," had always required a profession of regeneration before baptism, and had never been conscious of any evil from this course. We could but wonder at the declaration of the Methodist Conference. We knew that the creed of this powerful denomination was rather strong on baptismal regeneration, and we knew also that their form of administering baptism (sprinkling) was fully committed to this doctrine, but we had been led to hope that their practice was better than their creed. But in this official document in this report on the state of religion, written by an able committee, and adopted and published by the Conference, we find that our hopes were groundless. They declaim against "regeneration before baptism," and in this are directly at variance with the word of God. On this subject, as well as many others, Methodists and Baptists are as widely separated as the poles.

We quote from the Conference document, published, we think, in December last, that our readers may see what ground our Methodist friends are occupying on the question of regeneration:

"Baptism, too has been unnecessarily deferred, not only in the case of children but sometimes postponed to an indefinite period in the case of adults. The practice of requiring a public profession of regeneration before baptism, has resulted in evil, and that the design of the sacrament is perverted and the people encouraged to expect the Divine blessing without the use of means. We call attention to these evils, that we may seek diligently to remove them."

Let this suffice. "The profession of regeneration before baptism perverts the design of the sacrament, inasmuch as it encourages the people to expect the blessing of regeneration without the use of means," that is, without baptism. What more can Episcopal ritualists say? What more can Rome say? Blood will tell. Daughter, mother, grandmother; there is a family likeness."

I therefore restate my objection on this point. The M. E. Society in Carrollton, lacks an essential and vital characteristic of a scriptural church in that it is without a scriptural baptism, and by its teachings perverts and subverts the form, design, and intent of the ordinance, making it the means of regeneration, and thereby imperiling the souls of men.—[*Time out*.

[Mr. President, I will take fifteen minutes to put in all my new matter and you can allow the same to my opponent or take it from my next speech according to our understanding.]

It is evident, therefore, that Baptist churches can in no way endorse or approve what Methodists call "baptisms," though administered by immersion. Since it is not only administered by an organization that is not a church, and therefore has no authority, and by ministers unbaptized and unauthorized, but because the sign with which they are administered is both unscriptural and pernicious.

Methodism is without Scriptural baptism. But I furthermore

charge under this head, that teachings of the M. E. Society, in connection with the Lord's Supper, are both unscriptural and of pernicious tendency.

1. The Lord's Supper is held and practiced by Methodists as a "sacrament" in the sense that Wesley explains baptism to be one; that to the outward act there is an inward grace added, and that this grace is "converting," "regenerating," "justifying grace, and therefore her ministers offer it to, and urge its observance upon the unregenerate, in order to secure these graces. To prove that this is the standard doctrine of Methodism, I quote from Wesley's Works, Vol. III, pp. 188-189:

"Wed. 25.—From those words, 'All Scripture is given by inspiration of God,' I took occasion to speak of the ordinances of God, as they are means of grace.

"Although this expression of our Church, 'means of grace,' be not found in Scripture; yet, if the sense of it undeniably is, to cavil at the term is a mere strife of words.

"But the sense of it is undeniably found in the Scripture. For God hath in Scripture ordained prayer, reading or hearing, and the receiving the Lord's Supper, as the ordinary means of conveying his grace to man.

"Fri. 27.—I preached on 'Do this in remembrance of me.'

"In the ancient Church, every one who was baptized communicated daily. So in the Acts we read, they 'all continued daily in the breaking of bread and in prayer.'

"But in latter times, many have affirmed, that the Lord's Supper is not a converting, but a confirming ordinance.

"And among us it has been diligently taught, that none but those who are converted, who have received the Holy Ghost, who are believers in the full sense, ought to communicate.

"But experience shows the gross falsehood of that assertion, that the Lord's Supper is not a converting ordinance. Ye are the witnesses. For many now present know, the very beginning of your conversion to God (perhaps, in some, the first deep conviction) was wrought at the Lord's Supper. Now, one single instance of this kind overthrows the whole assertion.

"The falsehood of the other assertion appears both from the Scripture precept and example. Our Lord commanded those very men who were then unconverted, who had not yet received the Holy Ghost, who (in the full sense of the word) were not believers, to do this 'in remembrance of' him. Here the precept is clear. And to these he delivered the elements with his own hands. Here is example equally indisputable."

"Sat. 28.—I showed at large, 1. That the Lord's Supper was ordained by God, to be a means of conveying to men either preventing, or justifying, or sanctifying grace, according to their several necessities. 2. That the persons for whom it was ordained, are all those who know and feel that they want the grace of God, either to restrain them from sin, or to show their sins forgiven, or to renew their souls in the image of God. 3. That inasmuch as we come to his table, not to give him anything, but to receive whatsoever he sees best for us, there is no previous preparation indispensably necessary, but a desire to receive whatsoever he pleases to give. And, 4. That no fitness is required at the time of communicating, but a sense of our state, of our utter sinfulness and helplessness; every one who knows he is fit for hell, being just fit to come to Christ, in this as well as all other ways of his appointment."

That this is the accepted and approved present doctrine of Methodism, I will read to you from a book I hold in my hand, recently published, and now circulated over the land, titled "Wesleyana," in which will be found all I have read from Wesley, and much more :

"And that this is also an ordinary, stated means of receiving the grace of God, is evident from those words of the apostle which occur in the preceding chapter: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion [or communication] of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" 1 Cor. x, 16. Is not the eating of that bread, and the drinking of that cup, the outward, visible means whereby God conveys into our souls all that spiritual grace, that righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost, which were purchased by the body of Christ once broken, and the blood of Christ once shed for us? Let all, therefore, who truly desire the grace of God, eat of that bread, and drink of that cup."—Sermons, vol. i, p. 142.

"The grace of God given herein confirms to us the pardon of our sins, and enables us to leave them."

"If, therefore, we have any regard for the plain command of Christ, if we desire the pardon of our sins, if we wish for strength to believe, to love, and obey God, then we should neglect no opportunity of receiving the Lord's Supper; then we must never turn our backs on the feast which our Lord has prepared for us. We must neglect no occasion which the good providence of God affords us for this purpose."—Wesleyana, p. 248, 249.

The falsity of the assertion that Christ commanded all men to partake, is evident from the fact that he addressed the command to his disciples alone, and they constituted his church—they were baptized believers. Also of the language of Paul to the Corinthians. So perverted by Methodists and the advocates of an open table. "Let a man examine himself and so let him eat." This was addressed to the church members, professed believers and the baptized, and not to the world—the unbaptized or unconverted.

I could multiply proofs for hours, but these will be sufficient to convince all fair minded persons that I do not misrepresent the teachings of the M. E. Church. Then all who are familiar with the practice of Methodist preachers know that nothing is more common all over the land than for Presiding Elders at their communion seasons to urge the unconverted to come and eat as a "means of grace," a means of securing converting grace and the pardon of sin. It will be folly for Eld. Ditzler to deny it, for the testimony of thousands will confirm the truth of what I say.

How can Baptists even of the loosest sort, how can Presbyterians commune with Methodists and thus recognize and approve these teachings as Scriptural? The rite observed by them is not the Lord's Supper but a perversion of it, and Methodist Societies therefore have not this ordinance and lack this Scriptural characteristic—i. e. the Lord's Supper.—
[Fifteen minutes out.

DR. DITZLER'S SEVENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—In this speech, we will review a few things in our Brother's speech, ere we review our points. The assertions of Baronius is utterly false, contradicted by every historian, shown to be untrue by every one of the original historians of the church who were of the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries—Eusebius, Theodoset, Socrates, Sozoman, Eua-grius Philostergius;—by a literature of those centuries, contradicted and proven false by his own witness, Giesler.

As to a full-blown Pope, that never was reached in any of the centuries when he says the papacy was established, nor till A. D. 1073, when Hildebrand became Gregory VII, and he left it unperfected. He was the first who restricted the word pope to the Bishop of Rome. All aged proselytes and bishops were till then called pope—that is *papa*—father. When he makes Watson say baptism is the means by which we become Abraham's children, he makes him say what he never said, never thought of. It is like the host of cases wherein we have exposed him. He seems to make membership consist solely in the local congregation. If it does, then all members thereof, wicked and all, are members of God's church. You are compelled to keep up the distinction we have made plain and proved over and again. In Christ's Spiritual Church is lodged and held our real membership, and the local relation is but the expression of it.

He again pretends to quote Wesley. Dr. Graves has already put it beyond his power to hurt Wesley or us by his quotations and inferences where none such could be made. He knows Wesley never wrote it, that he says he did not. His biographer says he did not. Our bishops have published that he did not. It never was published by us. Has not been published by the M. E. Church for just forty years. It contradicts all our standards and Discipline. These facts would satisfy any man but such as Dr. Graves. He tells us Rome brought in Infant baptism. We have Orchard declaring that Rome did not practice it till long after A. D. 300, whereas Tertullian opposes it in North Africa one hundred and ten years before this, and fifty years before this the sixty-six bishops then make their unanimous decision that it is not necessary to wait till the infant is eight days old, to baptize it. So you may settle the

contradiction with your own author. As to our delaying baptism, we gave cases where Baptists in Missouri delayed it eighteen years! We promptly baptize as a rule; but there is no more need of haste in it than in any other duty—the Lord's Supper, etc.

He predicts Presiding Elders will go down. If our cause so requires, all right. Close communion is going down—not will do so—it *is* doing so.

We have met all his little points. They had nothing to do with the merits of the question whatever.

We again arrest your attention to our pains in relying on facts, in the Bible, and when treating of the Baptist church, we took only *their* recognized standards and allowed *them* to explain their own principles. We have all the time allowed Dr. Graves to explain and expound Baptist principles for the parties he represents. On the contrary he has assumed the right to garble our authorities, distort our language when even correctly reporting it, and he has spread a drag-net far and wide and raked the whole slimy depths to see what he could drag up and use as an exhibition of chagrin and spite against our church. Sad and mortifying has been his failure.

We now review our Scriptural arguments in brief and in part only. We started out with the Oneness of the Church in all ages. We come to the question—

WHERE THEN IS THE PRINCIPLE OF IDENTITY IN GOD'S CHURCH?

1. It is not sameness of the form of worship; for these varied in all ages, and during all dispensations. Abel's, Enoch's, Noah's day—Abraham's Moses' John Baptist's Christ's.

2. Not in sameness of ordinances or ceremonials—2000 years more. Then 400 years, only circumcision. Then it suspended 40 years, Josh. v. 1-8. Other ordinances introduced—Lev. viii, xiv., xv., xvi., etc.

3. Not in identity of ministers, etc., Patriarchal—Mosaic—a double Ministry—so in Christ's day.

4. Not in sameness of the people, as Jew, Gentile, bond, free are to come again.

5. It *must*, then, be in its principles and design. These have ALWAYS BEEN ONE. Hence, Heb. x. 38, 39; xi entire; xii. 1-22; Eph. iii. 15. I Cor. x. 3, 4; I Pet. i. 9, 10, 11; John i. 12, 13, 17, 18; Gal. iii. 6-9; Rom. xi.; iv. 3-11. Deut. vi. 4, 5; Mark xii. 28-34; Matt. vii. 16, sq., Matt. xxi. 33-33; John, x. 1-16; xv. 1-9; Rom. iv. 4-9; Gen. xv. 5, 6; Eph. ii. 10; Ps. li. 1-10; Eph. v. 25, 26; Titus iii. 5-7; Is. i. 16, 18; iv. 4, 11; iv. 3; Ezk. xxxvi. 25, 26; Rom. ii. 28, 29; Rom. iv. 3, 13.

For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumci-

sion, which is outward in the flesh ; but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly ; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter ; whose praise is not of men, but of God.—Rom. ii. 28, 29.

For what saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness. Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, Saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin. Cometh this blessedness then upon the circumcision only, or upon the uncircumcision also? for we say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness. How was it then reckoned? when he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised : that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised ; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also ; and the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of *that faith of our father Abraham*, which he had *being yet* uncircumcised.

For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith.—Rom. iv. 3-13.

Note here, we are pardoned as Abraham was, as David was, follow *in the steps* of Abraham.

6. What, then, were the essential principles that reigned through all dispensations, and constituted the unity, the *eternal oneness* of the church. Only the essential conditions of personal salvation. Nothing else was a condition. The cleansing efficacy of Christ's blood applied by faith through the Holy Spirit constituted this. Gen. vi. 3, 5 : xv. 6 : Rom. iv. 3-5 ; Is. liii. p. 5, 6, 10 ; Ps. li. 2, 7, 10 ; Is. i. 16, 18 ; iv. 4 : xlv. 3 : Heb. xi. and former references, I Tim. i. 5 ; I Pet. i. 9 : Rev. xiii. 10 ; xiv. 17, 18.

Love works no ill to his neighbor : therefore love is the fulfilling of the law."—Rom. xiii. 10.

For the Kingdom of God is not meat and drink ; but righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. For he that in these things serveth Christ is acceptable to God, and approved of men.—Rom. xiv. 17, 17.

Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned :—I Tim. i. 5. Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls.—I Pet. i. 9.

7 The Methodist Episcopal Church South, and North, always has, and does now teach these principles, observes the ordinances of the church, has every essential and even partially non-essential, constituent, principle and fact, going to constitute the church of God from any stand-point, and has the endorsement of all original Baptist writers, and founders of their church.

8. The unity of the church then is reduced to this : They *are one in Christ*. Eph. iv. 13-16 ; John xv. 1-7 : xvii. 21-23 : x. 7-16. They are one bread, and one body : I. Cor. x. 17—
all who have partaken by faith of Him.

9. We see then that the church is one—a Spiritual family. Any number of such people of God may organize themselves together under the laws of God at any time, and do there and then constitute a Scriptural church of Jesus Christ. Such a course the members at Carrollton took, and are a representative of Methodism. Thus our Proposition was established, and more besides. We had no need to do half we did to do so, but we wish the true idea of religion and church to be fixed in the minds of all.

We next showed that the Baptist idea of church and church government was not in the Bible. They are congregational. Each church an independent institution, making its own laws calling its own pastors, and not responsible to any part of the church but themselves, however much they may suffer from the evil doings, scandalous conduct, or persecutions of its members. This is not Republican—not Democratic. It is not a government of laws with well established checks, balances, right of appeal, etc. It is pure, unadulterated mobocracy—the iron will of an unchecked majority whose rights to oppress or override minorities are their own passionate and head-strong wills.

We called for Scripture proof of this independent order of church government in the Scriptures. As Dr. Graves has harped on these matters for years, he certainly could say for its defense what ever can be said. But not a text has he adduced to prove a point. He has attempted to show the organization of a church—so important a matter, yet not quoted one single line of Scripture to prove it!! Have I not given text after text, reading large paragraphs of Scripture, analyzing them, and giving scores of references to others of a like kind, while he deals in bold assertions and scrap literature.

1. We turned to the Bible, and found no congregationalism in the church in the Old Testament.

2. In John's day there was nothing of the kind. Nay, not even a church, in the Doctor's estimation.

3. We looked at it in Christ's day, and not a sign of it appeared, but the church was "One fold"—"One," not multitudes. This "one fold," could exist in hundreds of congregations or churches, but not as independent and law making bodies, but all ONE. Christ as Head in such a way as that if ONE suffers, ALL suffer with him, and were "ALL MEMBERS ONE OF ANOTHER"—one building, one household, and so under the same government. Rom. xii. 4, 5; 1 Cor. xii. 12-14; x. 17; Eph. i. 22, 23; John xv. 1-6: x. 1-16.

We asked him to show where Christ organized (1) a church—

a new church (2) where he organized separate congregations, officering them, etc? He did not pretend to try to show it.

4. We turned to Apostolic records and found that in Acts i. the Apostles and one hundred and twenty disciples (v. 15) elected one in place of Judas. Now these were eleven preachers representing no one single congregation, but the whole church. So the one hundred and twenty disciples belonged to no one congregation, but disciples from various places there present, and as a whole they act.

Acts vi. 1-6, presents a case of church action again. It was by "the multitude of the disciples" and the Apostles. When a proposition "pleased the whole multitude" of those, "the twelve called," "they chose Stephen," etc.

Acts viii. 14. We learn that "the Apostles which were at Jerusalem" sent Peter and John to take charge of what the deacon Philip had done in Samaria. By congregational rules this could not be done. When Peter went to the Gentiles (Acts x.), "the Apostles and brethren that were in Judea," took the matter in hand, "contended with him, xi. 1, 2, and settled on their policy, verse 18. Here we see again just the reverse of Baptist principles. The brethren "in Judea"—the whole body of believers, maintained the right to determine this question, not the local congregation established in Cornelius' house. In Acts xv. 2, "the Apostles and Elders" at Jerusalem settle the great question raised, though it was for distant churches. Here there is the reverse of all congregationalism. These facts, in the light of the fact that congregationalism never had existed, settle the question. Hence the words of Paul, Acts xx. 27-29—"Take heed to yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers"—Bishops—"to feed the church of God," etc. Here they act over the whole church, not a single congregation.

We showed the force of Christ's rule—"by their fruits ye shall know them!" We gave a history of the condition of Europe when Methodism rose, as well as of the American Colonies.

What were the doctrines preached then by Baptists? Old time iron-clad Calvinism of the most terrible character: for, unlike other Calvinistic bodies, whose learning and prudence greatly modified the system, the Baptists—"Particular"—went the whole length—hesitated not, but followed it into all its logical consequences, and preached infant damnation with a holy delight, while it was declared by them that it prejudiced the case for the sinner to do anything in the way of repenting and seeking salvation! They made man as passive in regen-

eration, and the use of the means thereto, as a piece of iron.

While this was the order of the day, let us hear the position of Watson, our standard Theologian—*Institutes*, p. 391—2 Part, ii. ch. xviii. He tells us in Paul's language, "the FREE GIFT came UPON ALL men unto justification of life." Capitals his. Hence he says, "all children, dying in infancy, must partake of it." The free gift is "the full reversal of the penalty of death," and "as fully within the reach of infants dying in infancy, as within the reach of adults living to years of choice." "It is by rejecting it that adults perish." Fletcher and Wesley are equally clear and distinct, but we need not quote more, when all honestly inclined people in the land know what we preach.

We saw what was the paralyzing effect of such miserable preaching. Dearth was in all the land. The other wing of their church preached the completest Arianism, Socinianism, and mutual hate and anger distinguished both sects. But for the civil law restraining they would have devoured each other in England. Being feeble they were compelled to keep the peace. Benedict, Backus, Cramp, their historians—sweeping from to-day back to 1771—for Backus began to write it then, and worked at it thirty years—give us a doleful picture of their success.

This is a doleful picture for the Church. Now you claim 1,500,000 members. Your historians—Jeter, Benedict, and Cramp, all give us the credit of this impulse. By their fruits ye shall know them. Here are some of our fruits. We not only number two adult members to your one, but all your gain you owe to us. "By their fruits ye shall know them!" Is that so? Now by the speed Baptists were making in the one hundred years they had, to-day they would have numbered some six thousand (6,000). We would thus have five hundred and eighty-three members (adults) to every single member in their church! And this is the saucy little creature we found stuck fast in the quicksands, mired down in doubt and the endless mazes of oriental mysticisms, and with a strong and generous hand, lifted you out, taught you to rig your sails, throw overboard a world of worse than useless rubbish and debris, and start again with propitious skies and favoring gales. But the coolness of the situation is, we found you shivering, freezing, dying, and kindled a great fire about you and when warmed into life, you turn and say—why it was no fire! and you strike for the lakes again.

The grand, newly-rigged Methodist ship, with a shouting, singing crew, a full armor, and manned for every conflict, came grandly over the waters, dashing the billows off with a

power and grace that made all hearts leap with just pride and satisfaction, when suddenly she came upon the Baptist ship, all dingy shivered, leaking, and wallowing in the waves, every pump agoing to keep afloat, and absolutely in the hands of a gang of pirates—held fast between the semi-infidelity of Arianism on one hand, and the cold, lifeless Mohammedan fatalism on the other. A few broadsides from our Man-of-war sent the captors to their dens, released the craft, took her into docks, had her repaired, kept out of water long enough to get dry and well cleared, when, no sooner does she start out than she squeaks out, “You are no ship—you are only a skiff—a society!!”

Ah, sirs, we are glad we had this question up, after all. If this conflict, invoked by the Baptists of the South and West, is to go on, it will be short and decisive. It will not last long, we assure you. In the vulgar language of the world, we have the dead wood on you. It is too late in the day to bring on such a conflict. We had become excessively peaceful. Our people had been playing a most contemptibly pusillanimous part in some places, we are forced to admit. There are many Methodists who would take their children to your churches, and sit and be outraged, vilified, misrepresented, traduced, and showing the brains of an oyster and the moral courage of a snail. They would plead with our people—oh, for the Lord’s sake, don’t preach on these subjects—it will produce “hard feelin’s.” My great-grand-aunt’s great-grand-nephew married the great-grand-neice of a Baptist and we don’t want any “feelin’s” hurt! Gentlemen, that game is played out!! That day is past. Those old idiots have to take a back seat for a while. And we are largely indebted to you, Doctor, and those of your kind, for this. Forbearance ceases to be a virtue sometimes, even in old dotards and Rip Van Winkles. “Patroclus’ wounds have raised his drowsy powers.” Sir, we have cleared our vessel for action. Our columbiads are on pivot and range taken. We mean business. We will have peace. Yes, sir, conquer a peace. We can—we will sweep the seas and clear the land of such attacks. Dr. Graves has talked of persecutions. Why you never knew what persecution was in comparison with what Presbyterians have suffered, what Independents suffered in the dark times of the seventeenth century in England and Scotland and Switzerland in the sixteenth century. You know nothing of what it was as compared to that of the Hollanders in the same seventeenth century and sixteenth. You were rather the pets of Romanism, because they knew if the Lutherans, Presbyterians and Independents were crushed, all

the Baptists and Anabaptists of the world would not make a good breakfast spell. They tickled and played with you as a mischievous cat does a mouse she has at her command. She wished to *use* you. She saw you were susceptible. She inflated your vanity, pandered to your liking, that she might use you as a means of dissention among Protestants, so as to bring it into all the disgrace possible, by civil wars, excesses and every form of fanaticism. Hence she loves to tell, as she does constantly—that the Bible taught Munzer murder, Stork, and his companions, as Anabaptists, to have a community of wives. She gloats over such things as a means of disgracing Protestantism. But my time is nearly out—I must close.

Methodism revived Christianity. It saved Protestantism at the last gasp. We appealed to the Bible, and proved that we are a Scriptural church. We appealed to its principles—we proved they sustained us. We tested the question by the rule Christ gave us, and we found it more than vindicated our claim. As to the Baptists, it is *only* on general principles we can allow that they are a church. They are a church irregular, not Scriptural in form, nor in all doctrine, nor in all leading practices, but pass muster on a platform of general principles—just as a whole.

Members of the Carrollton church—"ye are a chosen generation"—whose duty it is to vindicate your title to the exalted honor of being Methodists. Let the purest principles of our holy Christianity live in your hearts, bear fruit in your lives, and amid all the proscriptions that intolerance can put upon you, the insults it may offer you, or aspersions it may cast upon you, you will ever enjoy an enlarged prosperity and at last be welcomed from *the Church* militant to the church triumphant!—[*Time out.*]

DR. GRAVES' SEVENTH CLOSING REPLY

MR. PRESIDENT:—I have made an honest endeavor to discuss this proposition, and not to yield to the powerful temptation urged upon me, to leave it to discuss the claim of Baptist Churches to an unbroken succession, which has nothing to do with the question whether the local M. E. Society here in Carrollton possesses the Scriptural characteristics of a church of Christ, or a branch of the same. As he has spent so much time upon this question, I will say this: It is one of the deepest convictions of my faith, that essential continuity is one of the Scriptural characteristics of the Kingdom of Christ, which I understand embraces all his true, visible churches on earth, and I will now sum up and place before you all I have intimated upon this point, freed from the distortions and false colorings my opponent has placed upon them.

I believe that the Word of God clearly teaches that from the time the visible kingdom of Christ was established on this earth, and it must have been subsequent to Daniel's prophecy (see Dan. ii. 44), it must have been after the rise of the Grecian, and in the time of the Roman kingdom—it was "never to be broken in pieces," destroyed or "given to another people" than the "saints," but was to "stand forever." It matters not whether we can trace its unbroken continuity every day or year or century—yet the Word of God standeth forever. The Church of Christ must have a history. Christ declared that he builded, founded, called into existence his own church, and the gates of hell were not to prevail against it—it was not to be annihilated by the sword nor destroyed by the corruptions of Satan. If Christ's words be true, His Church has had a continuous existence from His day until our own, and if His words are not true He is not the Christ of God, and we have no Savior. The question then is not so much whether we can trace the history of His Church for every month or year or century, but whether He uttered a truth or a falsehood, whether the book we call the Bible be true, whether we have a Savior. Paul, addressing the Hebrews said, "We therefore receiving—*i. e.*, having received a Kingdom which *cannot be moved*." This was the visible organization which Christ had called into existence, and it was not to be moved from the face of the earth any more than it was to be shaken down

and blotted out. It does not devolve upon me nor any other friend of Christ to trace out the history of this kingdom, day by day, from Paul's time until now, to satisfy the skepticism of any, whether called Baptists, or Pedobaptists, but it is our duty to vindicate the word of our Master and honor it by our unshaken faith in his statement. That statement I believe as firmly as I believe that Jesus of Nazereth is the Son of God.

The New Testament is the rule of our faith and will be of the Church of the redeemed until He comes, and He has said "from the days of John the Baptist until *now*—"to-day"—the kingdom of Heaven suffereth [*i. e.*, will suffer] violence, and the violent will seek to overpower and rend it in pieces"—violently assail it, and this could not be true unless Christ has had a visible kingdom from the days of John the Baptist until now, to be assaulted, not only by fire and sword, but assailed as it is by my opponent, and all men sought to be turned away from it, into kingdoms set up by men in opposition to it.

Christ made a last revelation of himself to John on Patmos, and of things that were to transpire on the earth, in connection with, and to affect his churches in all the ages until he should return to earth to judge the nations, and to develop his church into universal dominion. The entire Book of Revelation is symbolical. The *Seven Churches* of Asia are as certainly symbolical as are all other things in the book denoted by "seven." Each "church" was the symbol of the history of the living churches during a specific period, and the seven, symbolized the entire history of Christ's true Churches until he stands "at the door and knocks." This last revelation therefore teaches that Christ has organized churches, and duly qualified ministers upon this earth from the days of John, the beloved Disciple until now, and he will have until the advent. The historic question lies between the Greek Catholic Church, and the Baptist denomination, and not between us and any existing Protestant Society, and much less between us and Methodism, which is but of yesterday—for no Protestant body claims an existence prior to the year 1500, except as they existed in the fruitful womb of the mother of Harlots. The Church of England claims a succession prior to Henry VIII. through the Latin, and thence through the Greek Catholic Church. But Methodism has no "ecclesiastical history." She is simply a "scheme of religious activity," "a human institution," in the language of her own writers; at first very similar to the "Young Men's Christian Associations of America"—to promote the spread of religion. If this last-named Association should, at its next Annual Convention, assume to itself the title of The Christian Church, and in fact as it is claimed for

it in a recent number of its Review, its claim would be as valid as is that of Methodism to be so considered and recognized, for, until 1784, Methodists were only "Societies," and were constituted into a "Church," by the Superintendent simply writing it so, and writing himself a Bishop.

The first argument I have urged to prove the negative of the question is :

I. They were not originated to be churches, nor are they recognized as such by the Bishops nor the Book of Discipline.

(1.) That the first Society like this ever formed by John Wesley he called a "Society," and not a church, and all others he ever formed like it in England and America, he called Societies.

(2.) Coke and Asbury and all the first Methodist leaders in America called them Societies.

(3.) All the Bishops North and South, in their pastoral addresses for ninety-two years past have called them Societies.

(4.) The Discipline denominates each one a Society, and no one of them a church.

(5.) There is not a Bishop nor a traveling preacher in the Methodist Society, who has membership in any one of them!

(6.) The "General Rules" by which the members are governed, denominate them "Societies."

(7.) No one of them, nor all of them together can do what the Discipline declares each particular church can do, *i. e.*, change or abolish rites and ceremonies—see Art. xxv.

If the question is not settled by this argument and proof, then we are ignorant of the force of proof and facts.

II. This Society and the whole scheme or system of Methodism was invented, devised, originated by two unregenerated men—who did not profess to pattern it after the Divine model found in the New Testament.

It is therefore, in the language of a distinguished Methodist author, merely "a human institution" and entitled to no more reverence or respect than any other mere human organization, as a Masonic Lodge or a Temperance Society, and therefore, those who join it do not join a church of Christ or a branch of the same, any more than he would by joining one of those human Societies. But the Church of Christ is of *God* and not of *man*, is from *heaven* and not of *earth*—was originated and set up by Jesus Christ himself when on earth—and not by apostle nor prophet, and much less by unregenerate men. The church which Christ left at Jerusalem was the appointed model of all future churches that have a right to assume the name of Church of Christ.

I have shown that for man, however pious, to originate and set up an organization radically different and to preach it for a Scriptural Church, and influence the people to enter it under the delusion that they are entering the Church of Christ, is an act of rebellion—high treason against the King of Zion.

III. The M. E. local Society in this place lacks another essential and vital characteristic of a Church of Christ, it has an unscriptural membership.

The only condition required of any one by the Book of Discipline is simply a *desire to be saved* while it receives and introduces the infants of all classes by baptism into its membership, and thus in one generation could it prevail the entire population of the nation would be gathered into it. So that if it is indeed a church it would not only annihilate by absorption all other denominations, but make the church co-extensive with the nation.

A scriptural church receives no one except upon a personal profession of faith in Christ and regeneration of heart, and hence is a spiritual body,

and in this respect answering to the definition of the Discipline, "a congregation of FAITHFUL MEN," those called to be saints—"the saved."

A Society that by organic law admits the unregenerate equally with the believer, the infant equally with the adult, lacks an essential characteristic of a Scriptural Church.

IV. The local Methodist Episcopal Society in this place, and similar ones in every other, are without Scriptural baptism, and therefore can in no sense be considered a Scriptural church. There are some things touching which all professed Christian churches and writers are agreed, and this is one of them, *i. e.*, without Scriptural baptism there can be no Scriptural Church. I have demonstrated that the act or acts performed by Methodist ministers for Christian baptism are not such, because—

(1). They have not the Scriptural authority to baptize anybody, and, therefore, their acts are null and void. The officers of a Masonic Lodge, or of any human institution, as the Young Mens' Christian Association, have no authority to administer church ordinances because the bodies of which they are members are not churches. Methodist Societies are human organizations and have no more authority to administer Church ordinances, than these non-ecclesiastical institutions; and

(2). Their sprinklings, and pourings, and more often moistenings, are not the act Christ himself observed, specified and commanded, nor can all the authority of a thousand human societies, nor ten thousand members, and Bishops of such, substitute these for the immersion Christ commanded. Those who have received only such are unbaptized as certainly as God's Word is true—and

(3). The design and end for which the Society here or the Methodist Episcopal organization of America administers the rite it calls baptism, is not merely unscriptural but pernicious, and imperils the souls of those who receive it.

I have shown beyond possible cavil or contradiction, that "baptism" so called, is administered by all Methodist ministers as a "Sacrament," a means of saving grace, in the ordinary way the appointed means of regeneration—so that without it in the ordinary way infants even cannot be saved unless baptized. So palpable is this doctrine that my opponent has not attempted to show that I have misquoted or misconstrued the language of either his Discipline, of Wesley or of his standard authors. How could he, when Bishop Cummins, followed by a body of Episcopal ministers seceded from the Episcopal Church because this doctrine confessedly characterizes its Ritual? Yet the Ritual of Methodist Societies is but a copy of that Episcopal Ritual. This doctrine of the Discipline and the Methodist standards is to-day troubling the consciences of hundreds of the more conscientious of her ministers, and will trouble more and more until it is expurgated. This then being the design of baptism as taught by the Society, though the act be immersion, it is and can in no sense be considered Christian baptism.

The M. E. Society in this place does not and cannot administer the Lord's Supper, since it has 1. No authority to do so more than a Masonic Lodge has, because a human society, and, 2. Because it administers bread and wine, which it calls the Lord's Supper, as the Romanists do, for a sacrament—a means of grace, of conversion, of the pardon of sin, and salvation. This is not only utterly to pervert, but it is to subvert and utterly destroy the institution. And again, it administers the rite to the professedly ungodly and unconverted, to convert them, and to the unbaptized, contrary to the order of the Word of God.

We must, if we credit the words of Christ, look upon the ordinances as administered by Methodist Societies, as null and vain service, for He hath said "in vain do ye worship me," observing or willing to observe for doctrine the commandments of men.

VI. My sixth argument mainly embodies my two last, the doctrines of the M. E. Society are unscriptural and subversive of the Scripture and of Christianity.

I have developed its teachings in connection with the ordinances, and to these I add another doctrine, that man's justification in the sight of God and salvation is dependent upon his own works of righteousness, and that this failing, the regenerated and adopted child of God will be cast off forever. This last will be discussed under the last proposition, and I leave it until then.

VII. My seventh argument was that the M. E. Society here and elsewhere is not organized and built according to the divine model given us in the New Testament, but in direct contravention of it, and the teachings of Christ.

I showed how the Apostolic churches were organized—in no sense as legislative but as executive democracies,—the whole body of the qualified membership having an equal voice—the ministers only the equals of each other.

And then by Methodist standards I showed that Methodism was a "Great Iron Wheel," a hierarchy—a ministerial despotism—and in the language of Bishop Bascom not only an "oppressive, despotic and irresponsible government, but one that libels the very genius of Christianity. Let it be remembered that this is the language of a man who was made a Bishop.

And now, Mr. President, you have heard his concluding speech upon this question. He has of course stated all his strongest points, as he has made his most fervid exhortation. You and all of us can see all that he has even *claimed* to do. Has he, as was incumbent upon him as a logical debater, shown what the characteristics of a Scriptural Church of Christ are, and then proved that the local M. E. Society here possessed these characteristics? Not a word of it! Has he in answer to my request a full score of times repeated, and to my reasonable demands, defined a *visible* Church of Christ, an organization that has laws and ordinances whose locality is on *this* earth? Who will say he has? No one. Though called upon most respectfully and most urgently for five days past to know if he will endorse the definition of "Church" given in the XIII. Art. of his own Discipline, has he answered yes? If any man or woman in this audience has heard him, will you raise your hand? No one has heard him!

Now I put this question to you all, would it not have been more becoming in him, who stands here as the professed and endorsed champion and defender of Methodism to have fairly, manfully and honorably, answered this question and accepted the defence of his Society and Discipline than to have spent his time attempting to pick some flaw in one of the links of the chain of Baptist Church Succession, a matter that has no more to do with this question than the question whether there be or not a northwest passage? Though it has been sought for three hundred years in vain, it has not been proven that there is none but as every new explorer has pene-

trated farther than the last, so it has been with Baptist history—the more thoroughly it is studied the clearer their claims—but one thing is manifest, Baptist Churches antedate any other existing religious organizations, and if they have not stood continuously since the ascension of Christ, then no Christian Churches have been on earth during *all* this period—but, another thing follows, if Christ has had witnessing Churches during all these ages, as he declared he would have, then Baptist Churches are those bodies—and to my mind the intensity, persistency and malignity with which Baptists are opposed and hated, and their distinctive principles have been and still are assailed by both Catholics and Protestants, as they were by Judaizing and Ritualizing teachers in the days of the Apostles, is to my mind an additional and a convincing proof of their claims.

But I was saying, I have presented seven honest objections to the claims of his Society, which I deem fundamental, and unanswered, must be considered as fatal to his cause, and has he met them, has he attempted to meet them? Has he even noticed them? Is not this strange? Would it not have been more becoming in him to have done so, and more satisfactory to his friends, than the chaffy and *ad captandum* exhortations with which he has regaled their partizan pride? But if he can afford thus to sacrifice himself and his cause, I should not complain. But here I put it on record, that he has from the beginning, persistently refused to discuss this question as he did the two last. I have had no disputant for the past six days. When a man refuses to define his terms, he ceases to be a disputant, and becomes a *wrangler*. Were I to re-discuss this question with him, I should appeal to the Rules, and refuse to occupy a moment's time until he had defined his terms; and I advise all who follow me to do so. But I will now tell you why he would not define a visible church. I will tell you why he has refused to endorse the definition laid down in his Discipline. *He knew it would be instant death to him to do so.*

There is not a definition of a Christian Church given by any Dictionary or by any protestant denomination on earth, that would include the Methodist Episcopal local Society of Carrollton. It is, indeed, as says Inskip, unique, *sui generis*, unlike every other religious organization on earth, like itself alone. If it is a Christian Church, no other religious bodies on earth are, or can be, and to direct your eyes away from it he has talked to you about the "invisible church" of theologians, a mere idealistic conception, but existing neither in Heaven nor on earth—nowhere except in the imaginations of men, and thus he has mocked the patience of the thoughtful,

and egregiously imposed upon the ignorance and credulity of his own brotherhood. And I will tell you why he has not told you, if he or any traveling preacher or Bishop has his membership in a local society like this here in Carrollton. If he should answer yes, he knew the Discipline would disprove his assertion and every living Methodist would know he answered falsely. If he answered no—then he would be confessing before this audience that he did not belong to a Christian church of any sort on earth!! Then the question would come up in the minds of Methodists here, and everywhere, who read this discussion: If the Methodist Episcopal local societies are indeed churches, how is it that a minister never was and never can be a member of them? But if the annual conference, the preachers' church, is indeed the Church, then why not let the laity have membership with them in it?

But I have shown by the decisions of the Supreme Court, that the only church of any sort and in connection with Methodism, is not the local Society, not a Quarterly, District, or Annual Conference, but the General Conference, which has an existence only two or three weeks at a time, once in four years, and in which no bishop, presiding elder, minister nor lay member—no Methodist in America has membership! and thus by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, which decision was accepted and endorsed by the Methodist Episcopal Church South, the local Methodist Episcopal Society here in Carrollton is not a church nor a branch of a Church of Jesus Christ.

But I must close. Those of you who can believe my opponent when he affirms that Cardinal Baronius, a *standard* historian of the Catholic church, falsified the facts of history, when he gave the very text of the letters of Bishop Gregory, both to Bishop John of Constantinople and the Emperor,—I can only pity your credulity. I will record my testimony that an opponent more reckless in his statements I never encountered. I am simply astonished beyond expression. One thing is settled that has been so universally denied all over this land. The Doctrinal Tracts did, when "The Great Iron Wheel" was written, contain all those extracts on baptismal regeneration that I quoted from it, and that that very identical treatise on Baptism is in Wesley's words, and is endorsed by the Methodists of both continents.

THE
GREAT CARROLLTON DEBATE.

FIFTH PROPOSITION.

BELIEVERS IN CHRIST ARE THE ONLY SUBJECTS CHRIST COM-
MANDED HIS APOSTLES TO BAPTIZE.

DR. GRAVES Affirms.

DR. DITZLER Denies.

[DR. GRAVES' OPENING SPEECH.]

MR. PRESIDENT:—This proposition was persistently urged upon Eld. Ditzler's committee to accept, and they as persistently refused to do so. Through my paper I challenged Eld. Ditzler to discuss it as it stands, one day, and he promptly accepted. I desired, for once in my life, to engage in a *limited* discussion upon this subject, one that should be confined "to the only law we have to baptize anybody," the commission of the only law-giver in Zion as recorded by the Holy Spirit by the hands of Matthew and Mark. I wanted the reading world to read one discussion that would not only be limited to the New Testament record, but to *one verse* of that record, the one that contains the words of the law, for with these, and these only, we have to do.

In all previous discussions, known to me, as in the discussion of this, during this debate, in different verbiage, days have been spent in the dim and shadowy dispensation of the past, in the vain attempt to explore some ground that would bear an inference or support an analogy, until the people, the only persons for whom this discussion is held, lost in the entanglements of the Old Jewish Economy became confused, wearied and disgusted and turn away not only without information, but with their sectarian prejudices confirmed. The discussion of this question admits of no reference to the Old Testament. Inferences and analogies and probabilities have no place here,

but, what saith the Lord Jesus in the few lines of the law of baptism? It is a question of *definition*, of *terms*, of the *principles of grammar*—in a word, of the *literal interpretation of the law*. The sole question is, what did Jesus say—WHOM DID HE COMMAND HIS APOSTLES TO BAPTIZE?

Mr. President, I must be permitted to say that there is not the shadow of a doubt as to the character he specified. Christ is not chargeable with the implied dishonor this discussion puts upon His Word, and Christianity, teaching the world, as it does, that it is a matter involved in thick darkness, and uncertainty—so thick and uncertain, that the best minds cannot clearly determine it, and hence this discussion. It is not because this law is ambiguous; to say so would be to impeach the wisdom and justice of the law-giver. There is not a child of twelve years in this State but can decide it in a moment, and would, if uninfluenced. Not a converted heathen on any shore but can do it on hearing it once read. Christ differs from all human and fallible law-makers. To ascertain *his* meaning, we have only to learn what he has *said*. He means what he says. If we have his words, we can ascertain without difficulty and without doubt, or his law is not binding upon us.

Have we his words, is the first question? Of this we can have no reasonable doubt. If we have not the "*ipsissima verba*"—words in the language he uttered the command, we have the very words in the Greek text, that the infallible Holy Spirit decided *were the exact equivalents of them*. It was the Spirit Christ promised should do this very thing. "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you *all things* and *bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you.*" John xiv 26. The Evangelists wrote these books in Greek, under the infallible guidings of the Spirit, and the Greek text is therefore the *ultimate source of appeal*. That we have faithful copies of the original MSS. made from them, we have no justifiable grounds to doubt. Of the Greek text of Matthew, containing the commission, there never has a doubt been raised—upon the genuineness of the last eleven verses of Mark's gospel containing the commission, suspicions have been cast. They are not found as it stands in two of the more recent Codices—*copies from the original*. But the grounds of the suspicion are so slight that those verses were not thrown out or even marked as doubtful in the version made by the Bible Union, nor by Griesbech before me—and we hear no question raised by the English Commission at present engaged upon a new version. If these last verses were not composed by Mark,

they doubtless were by some other inspired hand. It is not for us to discuss here. We cannot go back of the *textus receptus*.

Here is the law as received by both Matthew and Mark.

"Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen."—Matt. xxviii, 19, 20.

"Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."—Mark xvi, 15, 16.

This is the law, and the simple question is, Did Christ *command* any but believers to be baptized in this law? The settlement of the question from the very statement compels us to rest all upon the words of this commission. *The man that departs and endeavors to make it out some other way tacitly surrenders the question*—confesses judgment against himself.

DEAN ALFORD says: "As regards the command itself, no unprejudiced reader can doubt that it regards the outward rite of BAPTISM, so well known in this gospel as having been practiced by John, and received by the Lord himself. And thus it was immediately, and has been ever since, understood by the Church. As regards all attempts to explain away this sense, we may say—even setting aside the testimony furnished by the Acts of the Apostles,—that it is in the highest degree improbable that our Lord should have given, at a time when He was summing up the duties of his Church in such weighty words, a command couched in figurative or ambiguous language—one which He must have known would be interpreted by his disciples, now long accustomed to the rite and its name, otherwise than He intended it."—Greek Testament, p. 283.

My first argument is—

1. *If none are to be baptized by the command of Christ as recorded by Matthew and Mark, chapters 28 16, but such as are first disciplined, or those who believe the gospel preached, then, infants and unbelievers ought not to be baptized.*

2. But none are to be baptized by this command of Christ as recorded in the commission but such as are first disciplined, and believe the gospel preached.

3. Therefore those who cannot be disciplined and those who do not believe the gospel ought not to be baptized.

If my first premise is denied, then it follows that if any one thing may be practiced without the command of Christ, any number of things can as well, and not only unconscious babes, but every vile character of earth may be baptized as well as the *believer or disciple*. Then there is no conceivable limit to the law of baptism, not infants only, not the children of Christians only, but adults of every class, Pagans, idolaters, infidels and atheists can be baptized and thereby introduced into the Church of Christ.

It is claimed by ritualists that the apostles understood the term *Matheteusate* to include the idea of baptizing, and that in this commission the *baptizonti* is a *modal* participle explanatory of the verb "*matheteusate*." I therefore propose critically to examine this and each word and phrase of this commission.

MATHETEUSATE.

He had previously commissioned these apostles as well as the seventy to make disciples in the country of Judea, but that commission, in its very words we have not—we know they did not do this without authority. But there is one very important fact stated that throws a flood of clear light upon the meaning of this commission, burning away every particle of fog that has been blown upon it. We learn that they *made disciples—poiei kai baptizei*. There is no disputing the fact that the making preceded the baptizing, and was not done by the act of baptizing them. This, then, for three and a half years, had been the invariable practice of the apostles prior to the giving of the commission. The last commission was only an enlargement of the first. Before he had limited their ministry to the narrow confines of Judea, now, he makes it coextensive with the habitable world. We are prepared to translate the commission intelligibly, "Go ye, etc., and make disciples out of all nations." Make disciples as you have been doing while I was present with you, *preach* the gospel to all who can and will hear you, and those that gladly receive it, baptize into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, etc.

To no man, in the unbiased exercise of his mind and conscience would the idea occur; with the record of the Apostles' previous ministry before him, that Jesus intended by this phraseology to command them to make disciples by a new and never before practiced process: but he would decide at once that they were to go everywhere and do as they had been doing in Judea, and as John had disciplined them. Therefore a difficulty has to be suggested before one in a million of common readers would *conceive* of any.

It is claimed that the participle baptizing, stands as a modal adjunct to the verb teach—*i. e.*, disciple, and explains the manner in which the action is to be done. Now I do not deny that this phraseology is very common in Greek, or that participles following a verb without the article when in grammatical and rational concord with the subject, may often stand as modal adjuncts to the verbal predicate, but the question is, does *baptizontes* occupy such a position in *this* commission? To say that it does, is plainly a begging of the question—

taking for granted what must be proved—and that fortunately no man can prove, for the simple reason it is incapable of proof for two reasons: 1. The signification of the verb *matheteusate* will not permit of it. It means, to teach so as to make a disciple, to make disciples by proper instruction—"to disciple." The command calls for a disciple to be made before the next act is authorized to be commenced, for this the verb, from its very definition, implies and therefore it cannot be obeyed by doing the following act. The second act is not in rational concert with the first—*i. e.*, it cannot be accomplished by performing the first upon the object. There is another reason. 2. It is not the way Jesus had previously taught his Apostles that disciples were made, and to put this forced interpretation upon it would be without any previous warning or intimation, revolutionizing the whole previously taught plan of evangelizing the world. If he did indeed mean that they should make disciples by baptizing all classes of all nations he needed to have given them additional instructions. But that they did not so understand him, their entire practice the balance of their lives is a demonstration, for they never essayed to make any one a disciple by simply baptizing him. They *discipleized*, but it was invariably by instruction. The participle "baptizing" here then is undoubtedly a *temporal adjunct*, denoting a consequent act to be performed. To say therefore that Christ authorized his apostles to disciple the nations *by baptizing* them is simply adding to his word. But the claim, if granted would include the following participle as well—*teaching them*, and would compel the objector, in spite of his unwillingness to disciple by the *teaching* as well as by the baptizing, and the phraseology of the commission yields him not a shadow of authority for baptizing infants and children that cannot be instructed.

Let us now logically translate this commission, by ascertaining and using the *literal and primary definitions of the terms*, as our rules of interpretation require, Go ye therefore, *matheteusate* from *matheteuo*.

LIDDELL & SCOTT.—"*Matheteuo* to make a disciple of any one."

Dr. Samuel Johnson, the great lexicographer, defines disciple "a scholar; one that professes to receive instruction from another."

No infant ever did or can possess anything, or receive religious instruction from preaching.

DONNAGAN.—(New Testament) "To instruct."

SCHREVILLIUS.—"To teach."

HEDERICUS.—"To teach."

SCHLEUSNER.—"To make a disciple, and especially in the

New Testament to draw any one to the Christian religion." So all lexicons without exception.

But all I have consulted agree with these, it is useless to multiply them. I am willing to render it as the translators of our version do in the margin, "*make disciples or Christians of*, all the nations."

I quote in support of this the most noted of all the Pedobaptist theologians.

CALVIN.—"The evangelists frequently use the terms *believers* and *disciples* as equivalent, and especially Luke, in the Acts of the Apostles." "Christ orders those to be baptized who shall have given their names to the gospel, and shall have professed themselves disciples: partly that baptism may be to them the watchword of eternal life before God, partly the external sign of faith amongst men. Therefore in Mark it is said, 'He that believeth and is baptized.' By which words Christ joins baptism to doctrine, so that the former may be merely an accession to the latter."

LIMBORCH.—"They could not make disciples but by teaching. By this instruction the disciples were brought over to the faith before they were baptized. Mark xvi, 15, 16." "Hence also our Lord commanded that men should first be taught, and brought over to the faith, and after that be baptized, Matthew xxviii, 19; Mark xvi, 15, 16."—*Ins.*, l. v. c. 68, § 2.

GROTIUS.—"Since there are two ways of teaching, the one imperfect, by introduction to the first principles; the other by more extensive instruction: the former seems to be intended by *matheteuein*: for it means to initiate as it were into the doctrines and this is to precede baptism; the latter is pointed out by *didaskein*, which is to follow baptism."—*Anno.* on Matt. xxviii, 20

RIGALTII.—"The words of our Lord are exceedingly clear, who commands to teach before they baptize." This is not commanded expressly, but is taught by just and necessary implication. We have not in the commission the words firstly and secondly, but we have such an order in the instruction that Pedobaptists say with Jerome: "He commands the apostles first to teach all nations." It is very clear that the commission makes no distinction between baptizing some and baptizing others. If it implies that teaching and discipling are in one instance to precede baptism, it implies that all are to be taught and made disciples before baptism. Erasmus, Beza, Castalio, and others translate the words, "*Teach* all nations."

VENEMA, on Matt. xxviii 19, 20, says: "This is an excellent passage and explains the whole nature of baptism. Before persons were baptized, it was necessary for them to believe the preaching of the apostles, which faith they were to profess in baptism."—*Diss. Sac.*, l. ii, c. xiv, § 6.

EPISCOPUS.—"It is objected that *matheteusate* does not properly signify to teach, but to make disciples. Be it so, yet disciples could not be made except they were taught those things that pertained to the religion of Christ; for a disciple and a teacher are correlates."—*Resp. ad Quæst.*, quæst. xxxvii.

R. BAXTER.—"Go disciple me all nations, baptizing them: As for those that say, they are disciplined *by* baptizing, and not before baptizing, they speak not the sense of that text; nor that which is true or rational if they mean it absolutely as so spoken; else why should one be baptized more than another? When Christ layeth down in the apostolical commission the nature and order of His apostles' work, it is first to make disciples, and then to baptize them into the name of the Father, Son, and

Holy Ghost. And as it is a making disciples which is first expressed in Matthew, so Mark expoundeth. . . . 'He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved.' This is not like some occasional historical mention of baptism, but it is the very commission of Christ to His apostles for preaching and baptism, and purposely expresseth their several works in their several places and order. Their first task is by *teaching* to make disciples, which are by Mark called *believers*. The second work is to baptize them.

The third work is to teach them all other things, which are afterwards to be learned in the school of Christ. To condemn this order is to renounce all rules of order: for where can we expect to find it if not here? I profess, my conscience is fully satisfied, that it is one sort of faith, even saving, that must go before baptism."

Abp. NEWCOME.—'I suppose it granted that Jesus could not make disciples without instructing them in the nature of His kingdom.'—*Duraton, &c.*

T. BOSTON.—"The commission for baptizing runs so, first, to 'make disciples,' then to 'baptize' Matt. xxviii, 19. And this is the very native order of these things."—*Works*, p. 344.

J. FISHER and E. ERSKINE.—"Ought not teaching and preaching of the word to go before baptism? Yes! Because our Lord has joined them together, Matt. xxviii, 19. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them, &c. And accordingly it was the uniform practice of the apostles to preach when they baptized, Acts ii, 38, 41; viii, 35, 38; xvi, 32, 33."—*Fisher's Cate.*, p. 283.

M. POOLE.—"Go ye therefore and teach all nations.' The Greek is *Matheteusate*, make disciples of all nations; but that must be first by preaching, and instructing them in the principles of the Christian faith; and Mark expounds it, telling us our Savior said 'Go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature;' that is, to every reasonable creature capable of hearing and receiving it. I cannot be of their mind who think that persons may be baptized before they be taught: we want precedents of any such baptism in Scripture; though indeed we find precedents of persons baptized who had but a small degree of the knowledge of the gospel; but it should seem that they were first taught, that 'Jesus Christ was the Son of God,' and were not baptized till they professed such belief."—*Com.*, on Matt. xxviii, 18-20.

Dr. A. CLARKE.—"*Matheteusate* make disciples of all nations, bring them to an acquaintance with God who bought them, and then baptize them in the name of the Father," &c.—*Com.*, on Matt. xxviii, 19.

C. TAYLOR.—"'Teach all nations,' as you have taught the Jews; baptize all nations, as you have baptized the Jews, is their unlimited commission. Those who were baptized by John and by the apostles, were all volunteers."—*Facts and Evi., 2nd Let.*, p. 10.

TURRETINE.—"Infants are no more capable of actual faith than they are of that instruction with which the adults are to be taught and made disciples of Christ, Matt. xxviii, 16."—*Ins. Theol.*, p. ii, §9.

P. EDWARDS.—"The apostles are to make disciples—that is all *matheteusate* imports. But still the question is, how are they to make them? I answer, by teaching; for neither adult nor infant can be made a disciple without. And herein the Baptists are very right, and I agree with them, that adults and infants must be made disciples by teaching, or they will not be made so at all."—*Cand. Rea.*, p. 125.

Dr. MACKNIGHT.—"To be baptized into the name of any person, or into a person, is solemnly, as Locke observes, to enter one's self a disciple of him into whose name he is baptized, and to profess that he submits himself implicitly to his authority, and receives his doctrines and rules" (*Com.*, on 1 Cor., i, 13). "The truth is, both passages (Matt. xxviii, 19, 20, and Mark xvi, 15, 16) must be interpreted according to the subjects

treated of in them, which was plainly adult persons." In his *Par. on the Gos.*, he unites Matt. xxviii, 19, 20, with Mark xvi, 15, 26 and teaches that "they who believed were to be admitted into His church by the rite of baptism in the name of the Father," &c.

"*Ta ethna*" "go ye therefore make Christians of all nations—*ta ethna*. It is strangely claimed by some, who seem desperate in their attempts to get some authority from this commission to baptize infants—that as infants made a part of the nations they were therefore commanded to baptize them also! While every man knows that infants as such, do not make any part of the nations. I will grant it for the sake of argument, but what relief is afforded? Do not drunkards, infidels and idiots also make a part of the nations—indeed were not these very *ta ethna*—Gentile nations—the apostles were sent to, *idolaters* one and all; and will you say they were to be baptized without previous instruction and a reception of Christ by faith? I will put it in logical form—if all nations, or any in the nations ought to be, baptized before they are discipled, they idolaters, Turks, Pagans and Atheists, and their children, and servants, ought to be because they make part of the nations. But you say that idolaters, Turks, Pagans and Atheists and their children and servants ought not to be baptized before they are Christianized by teaching and faith. Therefore no nation or parts of nations should be baptized before they are discipled by teaching.

It is evident that an argument that proves too much, is fallacious and self-destructive.

The phrase "*matheteusate ta ethna*" then means only this, "make as many disciples out of the nations as you can; preach the gospel to such as *can*, and to all who *will*, hear you "*baptizantes autous*."

In interpreting the terms in which a law is written, and all legal phrases, we are compelled by all admitted laws of interpretation to give them their primary and usual meaning, and as I have abundantly shown that the *primary* and usual signification of *baptidzo* is to immerse, I hesitate not to translate it here—"immersing them." As Dean Alford says:

"It is in the highest degree improbable that Christ issued His command in *figurative* or *ambiguous* language, WHICH HE KNEW would be interpreted by His disciples, now long accustomed to the rite and its name, otherwise than he intended."

Dr. Stacey, of England, (Methodist) says:

"The apostles would naturally interpret the commission by their previous knowledge of its terms, and execute its requirements in a way agreeing with their well-understood practice."—*The. Sac.* p. 284.

Christ meant, unless He intended to deceive and mislead, to command the continued performance of the self-same ACT

that John the Baptist had administered to Him and His apostles in the river of Jordan—the self-same act to the self-same *characters*, which His apostles had administered during all his ministry. No candid man will question this.

EIS TO ONOMA.

Eis corresponds with our proposition *into*, and like, denotes a passage from a state or condition outside of a thing, to its interior parts. In all cases where the object is *penetrable* or capable of being entered, as a building, or organization, following a verb of *motion*, it places the subject *within* the object, as though completely covered, enveloped by and *buried* within it. It accomplishes an immersion within the object. He fled *into* the house, he fell *into* the *water*, he plunged into the forest, or was plunged into a bank of sand. It denotes in all instances a state of *intusposition*, expressed by the latin *intus*, within.

In its metaphorical use, which is in all cases where the object is not penetrable, or divisible, the figure is based on the *primitive* idea of *intus position*. The mind conceives of the idea of such an enwrapping of the subject by the object as that it is so completely within it as to be controlled by it. We are, therefore, said to “believe into Christ,” *which is the Greek idiom*—the idea is that we have passed from a state without—of unbelief and opposition, rebellion, into a state of union with, and conformity to, Christ. We have so completely entered His views and feelings as to be entirely under His influence and control—we have put Him on as a garment. It denotes the most perfect state of trust and oneness with Christ.

So the expressions plunged into destruction, or condemnation, or temptations, into debts, sorrows, miseries, shame, etc., implies a being wholly surrounded and overwhelmed by these. They envelop us on every side.

To the expression, “through faith into (Gr.) salvation,” “into obedience,” “into the blood of Christ,” “immersed into it,” “into a lively hope,” “into praise and honor,” “into unfeigned love”—all to be found in the original—denote a full entrance into the states indicated. If of salvation, so as to be clothed with it as with a garment. Isaiah says, “He hath clothed me with the garments of salvation.”

Now touching the phrase, baptized into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, denotes the passing of the subject *professedly* from a state the opposite of within—*i. e.*, *without*, a state of insubordination and rebellion, into a state of submission to and acquiescence in the authority of the triune God. Thus each one in the solemn act by which he

enters publicly the visible kingdom of God, is required to profess his spiritual *union* of heart and perfect incorporation with Him, whose name is Father, Son, and Spirit, and an entire consecration of life to the service of the tri-personal God, to be evermore controlled by him. We thus *professedly* put on the authority of God, while we profess our faith in the tri-personality of his existence. Baptism is therefore in every instance a *profession* of a personal faith, based upon the fact of a *previous spiritual union with Christ*. Is this Ritualism? Paul, therefore says, Gal. iii. 27, "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have *put on* Christ." Put on, taken upon you his authority, and a public prosession of future obedience to him. Baptism elsewhere, for this reason, is called "the *profession, homologia*, of our faith." Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed in pure water, let us hold fast the profession, *homologia*, of our faith." In the act of baptism, therefore, we not only profess a personal faith in Christ as Savior and law-giver, but we profess our faith in a tri-personal God, in the essential and perfect equality of the three divine persons of the Godhead. No Unitarian or Arian, any more than an unregenerate man or unconscious infant, can be baptized into the Trinity. The following authorities, all Pedobaptists, sustain these views.

GORMARUS.—"In Matt. xxviii, 19, our Lord speaks not concerning infants, but adults, who are capable of instruction."—Opera Theol., p. 148.

BECKMANN.—"That the word *mathetecucin*, according to its etymology, signifies to make disciples, is readily allowed by all. But this is not affected without instruction; for he who, as *mathetes*, learns from another, is rationally taught something by him. They therefore are disciples, who are taught and learn."—Exer. Theol., exer. vii.

DR. WALL.—"The commission given by our Savior to His disciples in the time of His mortal life, to baptize in the country of Judea, is not at all set down in Scripture; only it is said that they baptized (1) a great many. And the enlargement of that commission given them afterwards, Matt. xxviii, 19, to perform the same office among all the heathen nations, is set down in such brief words, that there is no particular direction given what they were to do in reference to the children of those that received the faith. And among all the persons that are recorded as baptized by the apostles, there is no express mention of any infant." (Infant Baptism, vol. i, pp. v, vi.)

DR. LARDNER.—"The language may be paraphrased thus: Go ye therefore into all the world, and teach, or disciple all nations; baptizing them into the profession of faith in, and an obligation to obey the doctrines taught by Christ."—In Dr. G. Payne's Lec. on Chris. Theol., vol. i, p. 299.

POOLE says: "In the name of the Father, &c. In the Greek it is *eis to onoma*, into the name in the authority, or (which is indeed the chief) into the profession of the Trinity of the persons in the one Divine Being."

DR. W. HANNA.—"To be baptized into the name, is to be taken up into, to be incorporated with Him whose name is Father, Son, and Holy

Ghost. The term is impressive or symbolic, not of a mere outward and formal acknowledgment or confession of our faith in the Divinity, as He has been pleased to reveal himself to us under that mysterious distinction of a threefold personality; but of an inward and spiritual communion, fellowship, with the Father, the Son, the Holy Ghost!"—The Forty, &c., pp. 174-175.

DR. LANGE, says Stier, "unfolds and paraphrases in its fulness of meaning the *eis to onoma*: 'they must be baptized in His presence, by His authority, into fellowship with Him, and blessed knowledge of His nature.'"—Words, &c. (Stier), vol. viii, pp. 308-309.

It gives me special pleasure to quote at some length the views of the learned Dr. A. Stevens, a standard and distinguished writer in my friend's denomination, and I think it able, clear and conclusive on this point.

"The church, in administering the rite, and the subjects, in receiving it, profess their faith in God, as revealed in the formula, and pledge themselves to him as their Lord." "By following him (Moses) into the sea, they (the Israelites) professed their faith in him as a leader and a commander; so in baptism the subject professes his faith in God as revealed in the formula; promises his obedience to Him. He is baptized unto, not by the authority of the Trinity." "With the explanation of this manifestation of God in the Son, the formula has nothing to do, and creeds should have as little. But the fact to be believed is there; and a profession of faith in it, on entering the church, is a necessity by Christ's command. In the rite of baptism the subject is required, or rather obliged, to profess his faith in Christ, not as divine simply, but under law, on the same plane with himself." "In the formula of baptism, the Holy Ghost is revealed as equal in being to the Father and Son, and something more. The term is not a synonym of Father and Son. It defines personality, and also a distinct relation to the subject of baptism. No person can receive this rite and not profess his faith in that special relation. He has wants that are met only by it. For what could be the meaning of baptism into one who is not needed? Baptism into the Holy Ghost is a pledge from the subject that he accepts Him as One who meets his wants, where they are not met by Father and Son. He professes that he has wants that are not provided for in the atonement; he is an alien from God, though the Son 'has finished the work the Father gave Him to do.' He looks to the Holy Ghost for help in this particular. This he must profess in baptism. For if all our wants as sinners were met by the Father and Son, there would be no meaning in being baptized into the Holy Ghost. One who does not believe in a new birth, by the Holy Ghost, cannot intelligently and honestly receive baptism in this formula."

I add but one more quotation: "And the church by Christ's command is required to demand this profession (of universal obedience to God) from all that are received as her members. She cannot administer baptism without this. She must meet her members as she receives them,—with a creed as a test of membership."—Quoted from Watchman and Reflector, Boston, issue Sept. 16, 1875. This the Baptist church does. It is true of no other church.

I then, Mr. President, accept the creed for my denomination, and I hold that it is involved in the baptismal formula that cannot be repeated without mockery, and I might say blasphemy over one that does not believe the doctrine of a tri-personal God, or who is both destitute and incapable of exercising any faith at all. The Papists baptize grave yards and churches, locomotives and bells, mules and horses, with this formula!

Is it not mockery—is it not *blasphemy*. But it is evident that a church bell is as morally conscious as an infant, and if this formula excludes the one it does the other. We plant ourselves here as Baptists under the shadow of the three sacred names, and declare that you cannot baptize any one, young or old, unless it personally, possess faith and is able to make a public profession of it in his baptism. This we hold as a people; and just because we do so hold, we also hold to believers baptism, and to a church no longer hereditary and national, but made up of “all in every place,” the world over, whose personal faith thus finds expression in baptism. Believers are to be baptized, and the baptized are believers. Children may thus believe without their parents, and parents without their children; the husband without the wife, and the wife without the husband. As the father’s sour grapes cannot set the children’s teeth on edge, so the father’s faith can bring the child to baptism only as his faithfulness works out a corresponding faith in the latter. As, at the last, each one must give account of himself to God, and the decision be based on Christ’s own declaration, “He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned,” so the door of Christ’s kingdom is opened only to those who in the very act of entrance profess their personal faith in Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

I call my opponent’s attention to the triple strength of this commission which offers an invincible refutation of all his claims however numerous or plausible, to any authority in God’s Word for the baptism of an infant. I am willing to rest the decision of the whole question upon this law, this only law for baptizing any one, Jew or Gentile, adult or infant. I could grant you that Abraham sprinkled his infants to admit them into his church if he had one—I say family and nothing more—I could admit that during the entire existence of the Jewish commonwealth, Jewish parents by God’s command sprinkled or baptized their infants; but I stand here under the New Dispensation, and acting under the New Covenant, and upon the threshold of the new church, with this new law in my hand that never before was published in the ear of earth, and I say to Eld. Ditzler, and I say to all Catholics and Protestants alike, you cannot for three invincible reasons baptize an infant or a bell, a church yard, or a dead sinner, under it. It positively and with threefold voice like the Trinity it proclaims, forbids the baptism of an infant or an unbeliever. Christ the only King in Zion, he who has all power in heaven and earth, commands that those baptized under it shall,

1-t. Be disciplined by Christian instruction—*Christianized*.

An infant cannot be instructed or disciplined. He commanded them first of all, says Mark, to preach the gospel to every creature. They could not preach to infants any more than to beasts and birds, and therefore he did not include an infant in the command.

2d. He commanded these disciples to be *immersed into the name*, etc., which involves faith, which infants cannot exercise, and therefore they no more than bells or birds are included, but legally excluded. Mark tells us that he specified the character to be baptized, "he that *believeth*"—i. e. the believer, an infant no more than a bell can believe, and therefore all unconscious non-believing beings, as well as inanimate objects, He positively forbade them, and His church in all future time, to baptize. But a third reason. He commanded His apostles to teach all those they baptized to observe all things, etc., which he had commanded. Infants cannot be taught, and therefore this law forever excludes them from christian baptism. If you baptize them it is under some other law than this, some law that God never gave; if He did, the Holy Spirit has not recorded it in this book. If you have authority, it is not of God, nor in His word. But this terrible phrase in some form starts out of every epistle, like a fiery cherub with his two edged sword to guard the way of baptism against the approach of the infant and unregenerate.

"Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized *into* Jesus Christ were baptized *into* his death?"

Baptized *into* Christ—baptized *into* death.

PRES. EDWARDS.—"Baptism, by which the primitive converts were admitted into the church, was used as an exhibition and token of their being visibly regenerated, dead to sin—as is evident by Rom. vi. throughout." He does not mean only that their baptism laid them under special obligation to these things, and was a mark and token of their engagement to be thus hereafter: but was designed as a mark, token, and exhibition of their being visibly thus already."—*Enqui. into Qual. for full Communion*.

DR. GOODWIN.—"He argues from the known and generally-received profession and practice of all Christians. Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized—that is, whoever of us that profess baptism into Christ, profess baptism into His death, as the thing intended by it."—*Works*, vol. iv, p. 30.

VITRINGA.—"To be baptized into Christ is beyond doubt to be baptized into this, that each should profess his communion with Christ; that each by that baptism, as by a sign and testimony, should avow that he had believed in Christ."—*Obs. Sac.*, iii, 22. 822.

R. BAXTER.—"Know ye not that when men are baptized they are by vow, covenant, and profession, listed into the belief of a crucified Savior, who died for sin to save us from it; and do profess that repentance by which we renounce it, as dead to it for the time to come? Therefore in our baptism we are dipped under the water, as signifying our covenant profession; that as He was buried for sin, we are dead and buried to sin;

that as the glorious power of God raised Him from the dead, so we should rise up to live to Him in holiness and newness of life" (*Par. on N. 2.*, on Rom. vi, 3, 4). "To be buried and risen with Christ signifieth, A being dead to sin, and alive to God and newness of life: and it is not only (as is feigned by the opposers) an engagement to this for the future, but a profession of it only at the present" (*Dispu. of Right to Sac.*)

W. GILPEN.—"The Christian, by his profession, is dead to sin. The very act of his initiation implies it. What does baptism represent but our dying to sin, and rising to righteousness? &c.—*Expo.*, Rom. vi, 1-4.

M. HENRY.—"Our baptism signifies our cutting off from the kingdom of sin; we profess to have no more to do with sin. Baptism is *eterna ansa Christi*, by which Christ lays hold on men, and men offer themselves to Christ. As Christ died for sin, we should die to sin. This was the profession and promise of our baptism" (*Com.*, on Ro. vi, 5). "Being baptized into Christ we are baptized into his death, that as He died and rose again, so, in conformity thereunto, we should die unto sin, and walk in newness of life (Ro. vi, 3, 4)" (*Com.*, on Gal. iii, 27). In his Treatise on Baptism, he says (p. 41), "We are said to be buried with Christ by baptism, and planted in the likeness of His death (Ro. vi, 4, 5); which intimates our dying to every sin." Again (pp. 43, 44), "Those who are baptized into Christ, have professedly put on Christ; and it is inconsistent with our putting on Christ, to make provision for the flesh to fulfil the lusts thereof."

Bp. PATRICK.—"We are baptized into His death.—We are buried with Him in baptism." "We by going into the water profess that we are willing to take up the cross, and die for Christ's sake."—In Booth's *Pæd. Ec.*, vol. i, p. 136.

Dr. MACKNIGHT.—"To be baptized" "into a person, is" "to enter one's self a disciple of him into whose name he is baptized, and to profess that he submits himself implicitly to his authority, and receives his doctrines and rules." "Buried with Him in baptism, as persons whose old man hath been crucified with Him (see Rom. vi, 6), in which baptism also, that it might be a complete emblem of your circumcision, ye have been raised with Him out of the water, as persons made spiritually alive, through your belief of the strong working of God who raised Him from the dead."—*Com.*, on 1 Cor. i, 13; Col. ii, 12.

Dr. WHITBY.—"For know ye not that as many (of us) as were baptized into (and by that baptism professed ourselves disciples of) Jesus Christ, were baptized into (the likeness of) His death, (and so engaged to die unto sin, as He died for sin, 1 Pe. iv, 1, 2, and this must also consequently be an engagement to live to Him that died for us, and rose again, 2 Cor. v, 15.) ver. 4 (For) therefore we are buried with Him by baptism, (plunging us under the water) into (a conformity to His) death, (which put His body under the earth,) that like as Christ was raised up from the grave by the glory (or power) of the Father, even so we also (thus dead in baptism) should (rise with Him and) walk in newness of life."—*Pura*, on Ro. vi, 3, 4.

Bp. TAYLOR.—"Baptism is never propounded, mentioned, or enjoined, as a means of remission of sins, or of eternal life, but something of duty, choice, and sanctity is joined with it, in order to the production of the end so mentioned. 'Know ye not that as many as are baptized into Jesus Christ, are baptized into His death' (Ro. vi, 4)? There is the mystery and the symbol together, and declared to be perpetually united, *oσoi eβαπτισθημεν*. All of us who are baptized into one, were baptized into the other, not only into the name of Christ, but into His death also. But the meaning of this as it is explained in the following words of St. Paul, makes much for our purpose; for to be baptized into His death signifies, To be buried with Him in baptism, that as Christ rose from the dead, we also should walk in newness of life (ver. 4). That is the full mystery of

baptism; for being baptized into His death, or which is all one in the next words, '*en omoiomati tou thanatou autou.*' 'Into the likeness of His death' (ver. 5), cannot go alone; if we be so planted into Christ, we shall be partakers of the resurrection; and that is not here instanced in precise reward, but in exact duty, for all this is nothing but crucifixion of the old man, a destroying of the body of sin, that we no longer serve sin (ver. 6). This indeed is truly to be baptized, both in the symbol and the mystery: whatsoever is less than this is but the symbol only, a mere ceremony, an *opus operatum*, a dead letter, an empty shadow, an instrument without an agent to manage, or force to actuate it."—*Lib. of Pro.*, pp. 344, 345.

E. BICKERSTETH.—"Baptism is the very token and sign that WE ARE dead to sin. How shall we, asks St. Paul, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death? therefore," &c. "Rom. vi, 2-8. The statement in the Colossians is similar, ii, 11-13; iii, 1-3." "The all-comprehensive blessing thus included in baptism is our being so brought thereby through faith into union with Christ as to share all He did. Hence we should by faith regard all that Christ went through as gone through for us; and we, believing in Him, are judicially regarded before God as having passed through all that He did. It does not appear to me that true faith in the apostle's statement can rest in a meaning short of this: So many of us (observe here the universality, every individual without exception) as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into His death. A similar universality in a distributive individuality we have, Gal. iii, 27. As many of you," &c.

Dr. A. CLARKE.—"To be baptized into Christ is to receive the doctrine of Christ crucified, and to receive baptism as a proof of the genuineness of that faith, and the obligation to live according to its precepts."—*Com.*, on Rom. vi, 3.

Dr. CHALMERS, having spoken of immersion as primitive baptism, says, "We advert to this for the purpose of throwing light on the analogy that is instituted in these verses (Rom. vi, 3, 4). Jesus Christ by death underwent this sort of baptism, even immersion under the ground, whence He soon emerged again by His resurrection. We being baptized into His death, are conceived to have made a similar translation; in the act of descending under the water of baptism to have resigned our old life, and in the act of ascending, to emerge in a second, or new life."—*Lec.* on Rom., on ch. vi.

(1) We ought not to practice in the name of Christ what we cannot prove from the Scriptures was ever instituted by Christ,

(2) But "It cannot be proved by Sacred Scripture that Infant Baptism was instituted by Christ."

(3) Therefore, Infant Baptism ought not to be performed in the name of Christ.

(1) If Christ requires teaching before baptism and will have none but believers admitted to baptism, we sin against Christ by baptizing mindless infants that can neither be taught nor are capable of exercising faith

(2) But Calvin declares that Christ does so require.

(3) *Ergo*, We sin against Christ by baptizing mindless infants.

BAXTER'S SYLLOGISM.

(1) If there can be no examples given in Scripture of anyone that was baptized without the profession of a saving faith nor any precept for so doing, then must we not baptize any without it.

(2) But the antecedent is true.

(3) Therefore is the consequent.

DR. DITZLER'S FIRST REPLY

As you see, this proposition is the same as the second, with me in the negative this time. We will briefly review the leading points in Dr. Graves' speech, then offset all by completely establishing the negative—that is, infant baptism. The Doctor relies on the commission to establish his position. I yet affirm that Matt. xxviii, 19, is our sole, our only authority to baptize anybody. Nor has the Doctor dissented, nor any one I know of.

He will grant that Abraham, Moses, etc., sprinkled the infants, if I prefer, but he stands on the new law of the commission. Very well. We stand on it also. "If you break down the limitation (of the commission) then pagans, infidels, etc., are to be baptized," he tells us. True. But what are the limitations, and where are they to be found? That is all important. We will find them in due order and time.

You say the man who baptizes one, makes the baptized party a member of the church of which he is a member: *i. e.*, of that individual congregation. Of what congregation did the journeying Philip make the traveling Eunuch? or Ananias, Saul of Tarsus? or John the multitudes? or Peter the house of Cornelius? John and Peter, the Samaritans, etc., etc., Acts viii, ix, x, xxii, etc.

But let us come to the commission, on which our Brother relies to destroy infant membership and the necessary consequent of that right, viz.: baptism.

1. Mark xvi, 15, 16. Here he tells us only believers are baptized. Infants cannot believe, therefore are not to be baptized. But (1) granting the authenticity of this passage, which is not in any Bible [MS.] or copy of a version earlier than the sixth century, and marked doubtful in all the versions and manuscripts in which it first appears, and all the most learned in this field, even of its defenders, such as Alford, Tregelles, etc., admit it was not written by Mark; yet (2) It proves nothing to the point. Believers are baptized here, and all Mark's unbelievers are damned. If this verse is meant to exclude all incapable of belief from baptism it means to damn them. All saved here have to believe in order to be saved, and are properly baptized when they believe. But as the same principle

that here disqualifies for baptism disqualifies for heaven, and necessarily includes damnation, it cannot be meant to exclude infants. "He that does not work shall not eat." "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread," etc., are as this verse, to be interpreted in the light of existing and recognized facts and common sense. Clearly the verse was meant to hold this much only: Of those capable of being preached to—"preach to every creature [capable of hearing]; he that believeth and [of course if he believes he will submit promptly, where possible, to the ordinances] is baptized, shall be saved. He that believeth not [rejects it] shall be damned." No one here is denied salvation or baptism, but such as being preached to, reject salvation.

2. The Doctor comes to what he knows is the only reliable and proper commission. Matt. xxviii, 19, 20. We cannot accept the marginal rendering "make Christians." *Mathateuo* never means "make Christians." The Doctor knows, as every scholar does, it is "disciple"—so all Baptists, Carson, Gale, Dr. Graves, A. Campbell, Dr. Wilkes, Anderson, Wilson, all are agreed here—all scholars of all churches. There is no dispute.

But immersionists contend that it necessarily includes previous instruction received, that the parties may be disciplined. Dr. Graves quotes Johnson that a disciple is a learner—one taught. Now we will show, first, that discipling, enrolling disciples, making or receiving disciples, does not necessarily include or imply previous instruction.

2. If it did, it would not destroy infant baptism or infant membership, but sustain it.

1. Then, discipling, in the Bible, does not necessarily include previous instruction. (1) The vast majority of scholars, Alford, Olshausen, Stier, Lightfoot, etc., maintain our views here. (2) The Bible completely settles it.

1. The teaching (*didaskontes*) is expressly named in the commission as coming after both discipling and baptism.

2. The whole economy of God's Government rested on this basis. Numbers iii, 28, "And the number of all the males, from a month old and upward, were eight thousand and six hundred, keeping the charge of the sanctuary." That is, these infants were enrolled, even at a month old, that they might be, at the earliest period, instructed in, and impressed with, the weight and responsibility of their charge—discipled. But far more decisive still, is the fact for the fifteen hundred years preceding the hour the first commission of Jesus, even [Matt. x, entire, and the second one, to Gentiles as well; (*ta ethe*) "the Gentiles,"] up to the hour of this commission, always

when a disciple was made from Gentiles, from Moses till Christ uttered these words, his infants always were disciplined—received in the Jewish Church—with the parent or parents. No one denies this. All admit it. Christ was a Jew. The twelve apostles were all Jews. People were thence forwarded to be disciplined to Christ. But, Matt. xviii, 5, Christ, with a little child before them, young enough to symbolize innocence, not to need repentance or conversion, declares, “Whoso shall receive one such little child, in my name, receiveth me.” Into what could little children be received? Does not this show an act of discipleship—receiving them in the name of Christ? But a learner, you say is a disciple. But Paul shows distinctly that people become such disciples or learners from infancy. 2 Timothy iii, 15, 16: “And (*apo brephous*) ‘from infancy,’ thou hast known the Holy Scriptures.” He had been taught, then, by his mother, Eunice, in infancy—was a disciple, learner, taught. Here, even if Dr. Graves should sustain his position, that disciple implies antecedent instruction, the New Testament puts it in proof that in infancy this can be done and was done. This sheds additional light on the words “bring up a child in the way he should go; train them up in the nature and admonition of the Lord”—disciple them.

3. Christ shows that previous instruction does not necessarily precede discipling, in the most renowned and striking instances in the world.

Matt. iv, 18, 19, 21, 22; ix, 9, shows that in not an instance of discipling the twelve apostles did teaching of any kind precede the act of enrolling them as his disciples. Teaching all who came afterward at indefinite periods.

Hence we have 1st refuted all the positions of the Doctor; 2d, completely sustained our own.

Let us now put ourselves in the condition to appreciate and understand the commission; its limitations as well. It is to be understood in the light of existing facts, customs and laws. No one can deny this. How dare you baptize with water? Why not with oil, wine, ink, blood or syrup? Why with water? The commission nowhere names “with water.” It simply says “baptize.” But religious baptism had been “with water” from Moses, though other elements were used for baptizing, and now John limited it to water, as proselyte baptism always had done. It was only “with water.” Hence this “limitation” remains, though not specified. The commission specifies no class save Gentiles, but no specified class of Gentiles. It does not name man, woman, children or infants. One class is as much specified as the other. Suppose we were to send out Methodist and Baptist missionaries to-day. We

would carefully provide for their finances, family comforts, select the field, arrange prospects, etc., but would Baptists specify what class to baptize? Why not? Because the habits, customs and well known practice of Baptists make it wholly unnecessary. They would disciple as Baptists. So these Jews. Suppose we were to send our teachers to organize public schools in Asia and Africa. What would the army of teachers naturally do? Receive just the ages to their schools they received here, unless positive directions attended ordering a different practice. For fifteen hundred years infants were always disciplined with their believing parents, and the Jews knew no other practice.

But let us now review some facts developed at great length in proposition second, on church oneness.

We must keep it before us, that Christ and his apostles and disciples were all Jews. That he and they never disparaged the Bible. That they only complained of the Jews ignoring it and disobeying it. That he came not to destroy even the law of the prophets. We must remember that the apostles called each other Jews all the time (Gal. ii, 13, 14, 15,) and that Christ said, "Search the Scriptures." John v, 29, "That the Bereans were more noble than those of Thessalonica, in that they searched the Scriptures daily to see whether those things were so," which the apostles taught. What Scriptures were these? The old Testament. Not a word of the New had been written. The early Christians tested all apostolic teaching and practice by that Old Testament that many of you immersionists now hold in contempt. What said Paul, in the last letter he ever wrote, just as he was about to be offered up and the time of his departure was at hand? This was long after Pentecost—long after Gentiles were brought in. 2 Tim. iii, 15, 16, 17, "And that from a child [from infancy] thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, [when he was an infant, 4, 5, years old, not a word of the New Testament was written. This is the Old Testament of which he speaks; and mark what Paul says further], which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, * * All Scripture is profitable for doctrine; * * for instruction in righteousness," etc. Thus Paul speaks at the close of his life.

We must further recollect that the gospel and the epistles came in one by one, scattered through the world in distant parts; that whole communities of churches would have only the Old Testament, till quite the close of the apostolic age. Others would have one, two or three of the epistles, some one gospel, others a couple of gospels, or one gospel and an epistle, etc. Few churches, even fifty years after Paul's death, had

all of his epistles or the gospels. Nay, the New Testament was not finished till A. D., 96. Not for another hundred years did many churches have all the New Testament bound up together. The Old with an epistle or so, was their source of light, so far as the Bible went. The old Testament, then, was yet pre-eminentlly the source of their instruction. In the light of all these facts, let us now look at the surroundings of the Jews who received, 1st, a commission to operate among the Jews of the lost sheep of the house of Israel. (Matt. x.) 2d, a commission to all Gentiles. Matt. xxviii, 19.

1. We saw (proposition second) that, to go no further back, God had a church from Moses till Christ appeared in the flesh to restore the paths and raise up (*anoikodomæso*) rebuild the tabernacle of David (the spiritual church restored) that had fallen into decay—to rebuild the ruins thereof (Acts xv, 16)—for “I will set it up again” (*anerthoso*) set upright again, *i. e.* strengthen, establish.

2. Stephen (Acts vii, 38; Paul, Heb. ii, 12; xii, 22) applies the words “the church” to God’s people in those times.

3. They were Spiritual. Christ was the foundation of their faith, its founder and finisher, the Spiritual food of all the pure and good. (1 Cor. x, 3–4; Peter, 1–9, etc., etc. This we established, speech first, proposition second.

4. That the word church (*ecclesia*), used by Christ and Paul, was borrowed from the Old Testament, used in the same sense exactly as there, and as in the Apochryphal writings of the Jews.

5. That they met after the captivity, not only in the temple, five centuries before Christ, and until Christ’s day, in synagogues, as well as in temples, to worship, as we do, and to these “assemblies of the upright” not only the Old Testament and Apochrypha, but Christ and Paul apply the word “church.” They had officers corresponding to our deacons, elders and bishops in the church; expelled members for immorality, as we do now, excommunicated, etc. All details were given in my opening speech on proposition second. Jesus Christ calls them “church” when he says, “tell it to the church.” (Matt. xviii, 17.) This is the second and last time Christ uses the word church, repeating it in the same verse. All the facts he names in this connection were familiar, well-known matters among all Jews then, as not only his words imply, but the writings of the Jews abundantly show. (See Selden, Opera. vols. I and II, Synedris; Lightfoot’s Horæ Heb., etc.) He used the word church there for a single congregation or local assembly of the church that met in any synagogue, just as we all use it daily now.

6. Infants enjoyed membership in the church, and were all baptized. The fact of infant membership is admitted by all immersionists. See A. Campbell's Ch. Bap. 108, 109 sq; Carson, a Baptist, (and Dr. Garves' favorite, pages 233 and 234.

Over and again have we defined the church. Over and again Dr. Graves says we did not. We read elaborate definitions of it twice. We showed the Greek words meaning "called," "called out," "assembled." So it occurs constantly in the Old and New Testaments. That it is used in a secular and religious sense—the Hebrew and Greek words. That as a religious word it had a two-fold application; 1st. it meant all God's people—all in a saved relation to him. In this sense it often applies to all those in Heaven and those in such saved relation on earth through all time. It occurs as applicable to all such of earth, in all ages, regarding the church as a unity. (See prop. 4; where this was elaborated also.) To this the most eminent Baptists have always adhered, though Dr. Graves and his adherents repudiate it. We quoted Bunyan, Ripley, etc., that any number of these may congregate, assemble and organize themselves, and as such form a local church—congregation of God's church.

Now these people are not a church because they congregate, assemble, etc. Not because they do this and are baptized, take the Lord's Supper. These are not the *diferentia*. Unconverted people, wicked mockers, Pharisees could do all these things. In what, then, consists true membership? Wherein have they membership? Not by virtue of identity with a local congregation, for that does not of itself constitute membership as just seen. Real membership, then, exists in our relation to the spiritual church—God's family, and any part of that family assembled, etc., constitutes a church in the local sense, as used in Matt. xviii, 17, etc., and often by Paul, James, etc. Hence Christ is the Head. It is in Christ we have membership—there alone. Here is where Baptists of to-day, and their writers, are in such confusion; in a perfect muddle. They have no clear conception of the church; no well-defined ideas of it. Now, while actual, real membership exists in the One universal church, its ordinary recognition or outward manifestation is through the local assembly of his people. Here ordinances are administered, membership recognized, and through these local assemblies all official action originates, directly or indirectly. All these matters were fully developed in former speeches, which see.

We showed formerly (prop 2, sp'ch 3d) that when Israel went out, laws were made for Proselytes—the first thing done, Ex. xii, 47-49; Num. ix, 14; xv, 15, 16. No baptism had yet

been named or ordained. Only circumcision is yet named, and the Lord's Supper, Ex. xii. Mark you, it says "One law" shall be for both; "One ordinance, one law and one manner shall be for you and the stranger that sojourneth with you." Here we see that the Jews and Proselytes were to be one in manner, law, ordinances. If Jews baptized, Gentiles had to be baptized. Lightfoot and others failed to notice the fact that the law for Proselytes was made in full before baptism was ordained, or named, (as it is not named till Exodus xxix: xxx: 18, 22, nor enforced till Lev. viii, 6), the Proselytes came under the same rite of baptism as all Jews.

7 All their infants were baptized—Jews or Proselyte. We give now just one example, Joel ii, 15, 17, as exhibiting the practice:

"Blow the trumpet in Zion, sanctify a fast, call a solemn assembly—Gather the people, sanctify (*ecclesian*) the church" (congregation in James). What does all this mean? What is up? How did the Priests "sanctify the church?" Paul and Moses tell us—Heb. ix, 13, where the water, in which the ashes of a heifer, "sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh." Num. viii, 7, "Thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them, sprinkling water of purifying on them." See also Num. xix, 9–18; John ii, 6.

But the sprinklings of Heb. ix, 13, and those v, 19, 21, are called by Paul "diverse baptisms." The word *diaphorais* means different in kind, different sorts. The elements were diverse, three or four in kind he names. The objects were four in kind—people, the book, the tabernacle and vessels of the ministry. Hence they were "diverse baptisms." Here, then, we have in Joel, the Priests baptizing the church on a most solemn occasion—sprinkling water upon them.

Well, says one, I've often asked for baby sprinkling—said it was not in the Bible—is that a case? Let us see. 1. We have the church. 2. They are sprinkled with water. 3. Paul calls it baptism. The mode has been settled already. We read on in Joel—"sanctify—[i. e., sprinkle water of purifying upon—baptize] the church, assemble the elders, gather the children." Oh, says one, that is it, is it? They were great big fellows—we baptize them—we want babes—unconscious babes—not eighteen years old children. Very well, I have not finished yet. And "those that suck the breasts"—how old are they? Are they eighteen years old? "Let the bridegroom go forth from his chamber, and the bride out of her closet. Let the priests, the ministers of the Lord weep, * * * and cry spare thy heritage, O Lord," etc. Here, most conspicuously, was there a great baby sprinkling, called by Paul baptism.

Now, then, we have the church; infants in it; infants baptized. Then, 1 Cor. x, 1, 2, all our fathers were baptized (*eis*) unto. You say unto the recognition of Moses as their leader—by God's baptizing them he meant to commit them to Moses as their lawgiver and leader. But the infants were baptized, thousands of them, in this the first recorded baptism of water in the world, and by the Almighty committed to Moses as their leader and legislator. They, of all others, were most dependent. And Paul says they were all baptized. All who were entrusted to Moses' leadership or protection. Hence we do not need the admission of Carson, A. Campbell, etc., that infants were in the Jewish church. All know that. When Christ came, when He gave His commission, for fifteen hundred years the Jews had made disciples from Gentiles. In all cases all infants were brought in with the parents. In no instance was an adult proselyte ever made in which the infant was left out. In all cases for fifteen hundred years, their babes were baptized. Under this state of things Christ says, "Of such is the Kingdom of Heaven." "Whoso receiveth one such little child in my name," etc. Under these circumstances He gave the commission; you, who in all cases for fifteen centuries have disciplined infants with their parents, baptizing both always; one manner, one law, one ordinance for them as for you; who baptize yourselves and infants—go now and "disciple the Gentiles" as well as restore the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and baptize them; just act as we have acted—recognize the infants as you have always done. Had Christ, Paul, and the twelve taught that in this respect a new law obtained, what a storm of indignation would have burst upon them on that issue! Paul was repeatedly arrested, tried, answered to the charges, Acts xxii, xxiii, xxiv, xxv, 2, 26, yet no such charge could be brought. But it is answered:

1. There is no record where John baptized a babe. We answer (1) Nor is there where he ever baptized a woman. Yet is that a reason for not so doing? (2) Nor is there any record that he baptized boys and girls; yet you do. (3) He baptized unto repentance and that Christ might be manifest to Israel; hence so many advocates of infant baptism think that John did not baptize infants because his baptism was unlike that of Christ and his apostles.

2. But there is no account where the apostles ever baptized infants. We answer, (1) Nor is there any record where any one of the twelve apostles ever baptized anybody. Not a word in the Bible tells us of a single case. (2) You baptize

children, yet you find it no where said in the New Testament that children were to be baptized. (3) Infant circumcision was practiced in the apostolic church constantly during all the apostolic age. Yet there is no recorded case of an actual occurrence of infant circumcision during the whole age. See Acts xv, 1-17; xxi entire. (4) There is no recorded case of a woman taking the Lord's Supper, and we know only full grown men, apostles at that, took it when it was ordained. Matt. xxvi, Mark xiv. Hence these objections amount to nothing at all.

3. But Paul did baptize several parties, yet is there no record where he baptized an infant. Well, they and Paul baptized Stephen's household, baptized the household of Lydia, all the household of the jailer, the household of Stephanus—the old Apostolic Version, the Peshito, renders it “her children,” all his children were baptized,” etc. Well, but they say there were no infants in any of the eight household baptisms. Very well, then, if you are sure of that, that is a sufficient reason why Paul did not baptize them. If there were babes in them, they were baptized. If there were none, that is the best reason why they were not. Just have it your own way. We have apostolic authority for baptizing “all that were in the house” of such believers as the jailer.

As to the cases of baptism, records, etc., we add further:

1. There is no record where any one of the twelve apostles was baptized.

2. There is no record where Ananias, who baptized Paul, was baptized.

3. There is no record where the seventy whom Christ sent out were baptized.

4. There is no record where the one hundred and twenty of Acts i, were ever baptized.

5. There is no record where John the baptizer was baptized.

6. None where the vast multitude of devout people on whom the baptizing spirit fell, Acts ii, 5-9, were baptized with water.

7. No record where Stephen or Philip was baptized, or any of the seven deacons.

8. There is no record where any Jew was ever baptized in New Testament apostolic history, only such as had actually rejected Christ and his authority. This speaks volumes; a matter, like so much of the above facts, unnoticed by writers and critics.

In the face of the omissions of so important a character as the above, had we a right to look for the special naming of infants in apostolic history?

Two points alone remain to be noticed. The objection is to proselyte baptism before the apostolic day, and the treatment the history of infant baptism received at Dr. Graves' hands, (the kind their writers always give it,) when I had no chance to reply, he reserving his views till his last negative speech, in violation of our rules. I let it pass as I knew it could be attended to under this proposition. He said that the word Tertullian used (*paululus*) meant a child and was meant simply for large children, minors, etc. So Orchard, Ford, Robinson and their historians all treat the matter, and declare that not till in the fifth or sixth century was infant baptism prevalent in the church.

To a historian who is honest, candid, such statements are so monstrous, so reckless, so wickedly grotesque, that one hardly knows how to characterize or reply to them.

As to proselyte baptism, the facts, the quotations, etc., were formerly put on record. The objection to it is that Josephus, Philo, Onkelos, Jonathan, Ben Uzziel and the New Testament do not name it. Their silence, therefore, is urged as the only proof against it. To this we reply:

1. Silence is not proof against historic records that are reasonable and consistent.

2. Josephus several times does refer to it undoubtedly, as well as the New Testament, e. g.. John iii, 5. This was elaborated in the former proposition, and never touched by the Doctor.

3. Their silence, were it so, is no proof, since we saw so much silence on baptism already referred to.

4. Onkelos, Jonathan, etc., were merely very literal translators; the first of the Pentateuch, the other of the Prophets, and it did not lay in their province to discuss anything, but to translate the Bible into Chaldee.

5. Eusebius, Socrates, Theodoret, Sozomon, Evagrius, etc., and hosts of Fathers—Latin, Greek, Syriac—who wrote when all admit it was in full practice among all the Jews, never named it at all. They discussed baptism, treated of it; Fathers like Origen, Pelagius, Cælestius, Augustine, etc., discuss why it was universally practiced. Yet in all, never refer to the practice of the Jews. Why could not M. Stuart and others have noticed that fact on the silence question?

As Dr. Graves said what he did in his closing speech on the second proposition—Infant Baptism—we now quote from Pelagius, Augustine, Cælestius, to show you what is the testimony in the fourth century. Pelagius was a Briton, born and lived in England. He was accused of heresy on depravity. Augustine held to "total depravity, inherited depravity." He

appealed to the universal practice of the church on a well known rite—baptism of infants, and as he believed regeneration was effected by baptism, he appeals to the universality of the practice as a proof that the Bible taught depravity, and that infant baptism was practiced to effect their regeneration and remission of Adamic sin. Here are his words: "Which the whole body of the church holds, as delivered to them, in the case of little infants baptized; who certainly cannot yet believe with the heart unto righteousness.

And if any one does ask for divine authority in this matter, though that which the whole church (*universa tenet ecclesia*) practices, and which has not been instituted by councils, but was ever in use, etc., (Wall 1, 159), he tells of their "crying and noise," "baptized when infants (*infantes*) or children," (*pueri*), interchanges *infantes* and *parvuli* of "those in whose hands they are brought," offered not merely by parents, but even masters of infant slaves offered them for baptism (1. 165). In the face of hundreds of such facts Baptist writers and Dr. Graves deny they were infants!! Pelagius, denying infant depravity, was charged with being in a dilemma. You baptize infants—the whole church does. It was apostolic, not instituted by councils. Where is the ground for such practices, if not for remission of Adamic sins? Pelagius maintained that it was not for that, for infants were not guilty, and could not be; but that while they were not liable to hell, yet they could not enter the kingdom of heaven unless baptized. Here are his words: "Men slander me as if I denied the sacrament to infants, or did promise the kingdom of heaven to some persons without the redemption of Christ, which is a thing that I never heard, no, not even any wicked heretic say." He then cites John iii. 5, with comments—in a word, "who can be so impious as to hinder infants from being baptized and being born again in Christ, and so make them miss the kingdom of heaven? etc. Who is there so impious as to refuse to an infant, of any age whatever, (*cujus libet ætatis*), the common redemption of mankind?" etc. (Wall 1, 279). Coelestius, the follower of Pelagius, but more extreme in denying depravity, says: "We own that infants (*infantes*) ought, according to the rule of the universal church, and according to the sentence of the gospel [i. e., John iii. 5, as they held it], to be baptized for the forgiveness of sins." (Wall 1, 280-1). He then urges it is not original or derived sin, Adamic, but admits of such words "remission of sins," to infants, "that we may not seem to make two sorts of baptism." We could multiply endlessly, almost, these quotations from nearly all the fathers, but it is needless. No man of candor and scholarship has denied or

will question these facts, for the language is too plain. Notice how they speak. Origen speaks of them as "but a day old," and "have no sin of their own," as do others. Chrysostom says, (*ta brephæ*), "Infants that have no sin are baptized."

They interchange *parvulus* a little child, diminutive of *parvus*, a child, with *infans*, an infant. Where Pelagius says *parvuli*, his friend and Admirer says *infantes*, infants. Their opponent, Augustine, tells how their mothers carried, brought, presented them "in their hands," that they had no choice, interchanges *infantes* and *parvuli*, infants and little children. Not only this, but as Tertullian lived in North Africa, hence Pelagius, of England, had never heard of his short-lived opposition. Origen, who lived in North Africa, the most learned of all Greek fathers, gives their age "as a day" when needing baptism. In North Africa, where, at that time more colleges, more schools, more extensive libraries, more grammarians and teachers flourished than on any spot on the globe; where, A. D. 381, the Bishop of Alexandria was as influential almost as an emperor; in North Africa, A. D. 251-53, the council of sixty-six bishops decided unanimously that it was not necessary to defer the baptizing of infants till they were over eight days old, the question being put by Fidus whether they should wait that long, that being the only question on the subject before them.

This is the most intellectual, cultivated part of the church in that age. The great Cyprian, the most noted of all Latin fathers of that age by far, was in it. No discussion was sprung, no question raised as to its apostolicity. No part of christendom is hinted at as not practicing it. This is A. D. 253. They name the ages of the infants "four or five days," not necessary to wait till they were eight days old. Yet Baptist writers, published and eulogized and endorsed by Dr. Graves, tell us that only minors, people under age simply, are meant by the *parvuli* and *infantes* of these fathers! Now, the church unanimously baptized, A. D. 253, infants. Origen, writing A. D. 215, shows it was unanimous in his day, and he, the greatest tourist of his age, the child of Christian ancestors since the days of the apostles. Tertullian, A. D. 190, shows it to have been universally prevalent in his day by the manner of his opposition and style of argument. See my speech on history of it, second proposition. Irenæus, A. D. 166 to 180, Hippolytus, 220, on heresies, never hint it as an innovation or heresy. So it came not in practice in their day. Irenæus, born four years before John the Apostle died, names it as a universal practice in his day, under the term regenerated—"infants, etc., are regenerated unto God." On the testimony

of Irenaeus, Tertullian and Origen, we refer to the speech above alluded to where it is full. We see that infant baptism was in the church everywhere in Origen's day, Tertullian's day, Irenaeus' day. It could not have come in during any period subsequent to the apostolic day without producing a vastly different record and series of facts from what we have, for it implied a complete change, 1. In the doctrines of the church; 2. In its practices and the design of its ordinances, from the immersion stand-point.

Dr. Graves objects that it is against the symbolic import of baptism. But here he errs, as usual, on this subject. He makes baptism a symbol of death, burial, resurrection—that it is an actual entrance into the church, a gate, a door, and a sign. Ingham and others make baptism to be seven things; indeed, they make it a little god. It is everything—a bundle of absurdities and contradictions. Confusion reigns here. Now water, the world over, in all ages, has symbolized innocence. So David, and later Pilate, washed their hands, symbolizing innocence. All history shows this. Hence it comes to represent the pouring on us of the Spirit, by which we as transgressors are made pure that we may be innocent before God. From the beginning of baptism in Moses' day it symbolized that innocence and qualification for approach to God that all need. Hence priests and people approaching the altar had to baptize or be baptized before going into God's presence in the tabernacle or temple. But all infants are innocent before God. They inherit a fallen, depraved nature, and have that moral taint which all men have; but it is not guilt or sin in the sense of transgression—is not sinful. Christ removed all condemnation that came as the effect of Adam's transgression, as Paul (Rom. iii. entire,) teaches. Hence we are responsible for the deeds done in the body. We teach that no infant is in infancy liable to be lost. All are in a saved relation, and can only be lost by actual transgressions. As to what takes place in them or us in death God has said nothing, and to be wise above what is written is very unwise.

Hence infants are the most proper of all subjects of baptism. In baptizing adults they may be fit subjects or may not. We can't read their hearts. But infants I know are innocent, and “of such is the kingdom of heaven.”

Making baptism a symbol of death, etc.,

1. Violates its whole historic import, for never on earth, among any people, did it have such meaning.

2. It represented the Spirit's action in purifying man's moral nature, the source of life, not of death.

3. John's baptism was "with water," "unto repentance," not death. Its general object was that "Christ might be made manifest to Israel."

4. Dr. Graves says there was no church in John's day, hence baptism could not be the door or initiatory rite into a thing that did not exist. He admits that those who first constituted the church came in without this process; were organized on the Mount, where no one was baptized. Where, then, comes all this nonsense about initiation, initiatory rite of baptism? etc. But he says our Discipline has it in the ritual. But we can use that or not; it is not our faith, our creed, our doctrine. Some believe it, most of us do not. I repudiate it out and out—the initiatory business.

Look, then, here are the facts:

For 1,500 years infant baptism was the practice. For 1,500 years infants were a part of the church. We could carry it further back, as formerly we did, but need not. For 1,500 years all Gentiles coming into the Jewish church had their infants disciplined. No exception ever occurred. With these precedents, Christ, a Jew, commands twelve Jews to "go, disciple all the Gentiles," as already all Jews had been included in their field of labor, (Matt. x. entire), baptizing all they could disciple. Hence, as the great Dr. Bledsoe truly says, the commission ordains infant baptism. It does not specify any class. It does not specifically name any class. But such a command, under such existing practices and doctrines, was a continuation of it by positive command. But to establish Dr. Graves's position he must

1. Destroy the church in which Moses, Abraham, Abel, Christ, the twelve, the seventy, the one hundred and twenty, the devout and pious on Pentecost, before the three thousand were converted, had membership.

2. Organize a new one; which he can never do.

3. On radically different principles from all the past.

4. That the principles are so radically revolutionary that they eject all infants.

5. He should then show us at what age a child dare be baptized—becomes so responsible that its faith entitles it to baptism—to make the matter safe to it as well as to the church. Yet not one of these things has been done, nor can be. We have demonstrated the fact that the commission was as much a command to baptize infants as it was adult believers.

DR. GRAVES' SECOND SPEECH.

MR. PRESIDENT.—Paul evidently had this idea in his mind when he asked were ye baptized *eis ton onoma*, into the name of Paul? and said “I thank God that I baptized none of you save Crispus and Gaius, lest any should say I baptized *eis to emon onoma*, into my own name.”

“Is Christ Divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul? And I baptized also the household of Stephanas: besides, I know not whether I baptized any other.”—I Cor. i. 13, 16.

From the force of this expression *eis to onoma*, alone, we learn that Paul baptized no infant or unbeliever in the households of Crispus, Gaius, or Stephanas, for he baptized *into the name* of the Trinity, and no infant or unbeliever could make the requisite profession.

In I Cor. x. 2, we meet with the expression *eis ton monsen Ebaptizante*. If my opponent will again claim that infants should be baptized because they were in the families of the Israelites when they were here baptized, I answer, his argument proves too much; for it would embrace all ages and all characters, with the bodies of the dead, for they were carrying these along with them. But here starts up the *eis ton monsen*, like sword of cherubim turning every way. Only those were baptized here who could be and were baptized *eis ton monsen*, “the fathers” alone—adults of Israel. I will read one or two authorities to fix the force of the phrase “*eis to onoma*” in your minds.

“*Eis hen soma*.”

“Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?”—I Cor. xii. 13.

The apostle does not say some of the members of this church had been baptized “*eis hen soma*” but that all who had been baptized had so been, and whatever this phrase implies, every one baptized up to this time in Corinth had made the profession or voluntarily entered the relation. Now then by a reference to the context, we learn this phrase means that in one and the same spirit that dwelt within and animated them, *i. e.*, the spirit of faith and of obedient submission to Christ, they had all been baptized into one body—the Church—and had been made to drink into the same spirit.

From all these similar phrases there is no avoiding the conclusive force of *eis to onoma* in the commission. It carries along with it *two ideas*, an immersion and a *profession* of personal faith.

But returning to the commission we have another command : "*di daskentes autous*," "teaching them." All are agreed that this verb means to teach. If the position I have previously noticed, that *baptizontes*, is a modal participle following and explaining the verb *matheteusate*, which was taken in order to avoid the necessity of instructing the infants before baptism, then is this participle modal also and it certainly demands that the subjects of baptism be taught. Teaching them, whom? Evidently all those who had been baptized! If they were commanded to baptize an infant they were equally commanded to teach it,—to do what? Observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. Among these "all things," no one will deny that the Lord's Supper was included. They were then to teach all whom they had authority to baptize, infants as well as adults, the unbeliever as well as the saint, to observe the Lord's Supper Will Eld. Ditzler accept the logical conclusion of this premise? He will not carry out the commission as he interprets it. He will not bring his mindless infants to the Supper, and teach them the meaning of the emblems and give them to eat. Why not? Think of it, he denies to more than half his legitimate members one of the ordinances of the church. The Catholics administer only one kind to the *laity*. Methodists deny both to the majority of their own members.

Let us notice the mountain strength of this commission against infants and unbelievers.

1. It commands that the subject should be disciplined, Christianized, which alone can be done by instruction. But the infant cannot be disciplined, and therefore it is excluded by the very terms of the law. It cannot be baptized. To do so would be to violate the express letter of the law.

2. Those taught, disciplined, must be baptized into the name of the Trinity. I have demonstrated to you that an infant cannot be baptized into the name of the Trinity or into any other name or thing on earth, for the phrase implies and demands a profession of faith and subjection, which no infant and no unregenerate person can make, and therefore no infant or unregenerate person can possibly be baptized under this commission. To them it would be a meaningless ceremony, to every intelligent Christian profanation of the ordinance, and in the eye of God a gross violation of the law of baptism.

3. Those baptized are to be immediately taught to observe Christ's commandments and infants can neither be taught nor can they obey, and therefore, are no less than four times excluded by the very express terms of the law, sufficient evidence to my mind of its verbal inspiration. The Omniscient Savior knew what service the advocates of infant baptism would try to force this commission into, and hence every word he used he made a most effectual guard and prohibition of it.

If it is claimed that it means only on the authority of the Trinity, let them show the authority not in example, but the express *command of Christ*, for so our proposition reads—

BELIEVERS IN CHRIST ARE THE ONLY SUBJECTS CHRIST COMMANDED HIS APOSTLES TO BAPTIZE.

Mr. President, I am worn out with my opponent's trifling with propositions he is professing to discuss by refusing to define the terms he uses, and using terms of double or ambiguous meanings, and always discussing some other proposition than the one really in debate. He has done it in every instance in open violation of the rules governing this debate, and he has observed the same course thus far on this proposition. Now with all the emphasis of earnestness, I demand that he discuss this proposition and show us when he rises, where *Christ has commanded* the baptism of any but professed believers. There is no place for inferences or analogies or examples, under *this* proposition, but for *commands* only, and only for Christ's commands at that. Will he show one, and will you all listen for it.

I will now read the law as recorded by Mark :

"Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."—Mark, xvi. 15, 16.

How divinely transparent the meaning of this law. Language could not be more specific, unambiguous, and plain to the most simple, as the way-faring man, though a fool, need not err in understanding it, and would not doubt one moment as to whom Christ commanded the apostles to baptize.

There is a principle of interpretation in all law, which is as old as the Justinian Code. It reads, "*expressio unius est exclusio alterius*." The specification of one thing prohibits every other. Now apply this to each phrase of this commission.

"Go." He forbade them by this to remain in Jerusalem or settle permanently on any one place. He constituted his apostles itinerant missionaries, and forbade them to become pastors. They were missionaries most emphatically. *Preach, laborate, proclaim*, as does a herald or public crier. This for-

made them to write it out, or read it, however handsomely and elegantly they might do it—"preach the Gospel. The man who reads carefully prepared essays from the pulpit deceives himself if he imagines that he is *preaching*. Kurusso means to *proclaim* with eye and voice united, to the people as a herald is wont to do, and as Jonah did to the Ninevites and as Christ did to the multitudes. The pulpit has lost its power over the people, and the houses of worship are emptied through the violation of this command—"Preach the Gospel." Not philosophy, or poetry, or science and worldly wisdom, and the *theories* of men, but the *Gospel, the good news of the Kingdom*,—salvation through "the crucified one."

He evidently did not mean those creatures who are not the subjects of gospel address—beasts and birds—nor to idiots or infants. It being as impossible to preach to them, as it would be to stocks and stones. No reasonable man will say they, infants, are included in this commission, and we will presently see that they are not or they are all lost. "He that *believeth*—This is equivalent to baptize all who believe the gospel you preach—believe with the heart unto righteousness. According to our rule, Christ forbade them to baptize an infant or unbeliever as certainly as he did bells and graveyards. Is there any doubt as to whom the apostles were commanded here to baptize? Is there a rational child that could mistake, here? Was ever an order more simple, more plain? idiocy alone could misunderstand it—willfulness alone could pervert it. Does not Christ specify the character to be baptized—"he that believeth," not all to whom they might preach by any means, but those of them who should believe.

"*Immersing* them." This is a specific prohibition of the rites men have brought in as substitutes, as sprinkling or pouring water upon the heads of the subjects. To perform any other act than *the one* he commanded, is a palpable violation of his express law.

That the term baptize means primarily and specifically to immerse, all lexicographers and scholars of any note are agreed, says Moses Stuart; and to perform any other act instead, is to violate the law; every other act is prohibited. Immersing them into the name of *the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit*. Now I submit it to you, Mr. President, and to every man, woman and child, whether, if the Apostles had substituted other three names for the adorable ones, would they not have palpably violated the law? Suppose they had baptized into the name of Shadrach, Meshech, and Abednego, would they not have violated and profaned

the law? Were they not forbidden to baptize in any other names and simply because these names were specified.

When God commanded Noah to make the ark of *gopher* wood, did he not forbid him to make it of any other? would he not have violated the command had he made it of white pine or hickory? Apply this self-evident rule.

In Matthew's commission Christ specifies the *disciples* as the ones to be baptized. Did he not forbid them to baptize the undisciplined? the untaught? Mark says he commanded those believing, to be baptized. Did he not therefore, forbid the baptism in *His name* of those who *do not* and those who *cannot* believe? you know, and every thinking man knows, that he did. I therefore affirm, and no man can successfully deny it, and no man would do his intelligence and fair-mindedness any credit by attempting to deny, that Christ *positively forbade* the baptism of any but a believer. To say that this law does not prohibit the baptism of an unbeliever and of a non-believer, is to say that positive law means nothing.

If a cloud is supposed by any one to rest upon the law, owing to translation or otherwise, then we may properly ask if the same lawgiver has indicated his will elsewhere touching the same thing or by his own acts or his practices. Though there rests no cloud of doubt or ambiguity upon the commission, I will refer briefly to these other sources of proof.

The first officer He ordained to administer His baptism, was John the Baptist. "He that sent me to baptize—immerse in water." The act that this officer performed was the first instance of Christian baptism within the lids of the Bible. We have not the very words of the order, yet we can learn whom Christ authorized to be baptized by observing those whom He did baptize.

We find he observed the very order found in the commission. 1. He first preached to the people. 2. He baptized only those who became disciples to his doctrine, and gave him satisfactory proofs of repentance toward God and faith in Christ, and none others. Others came and requested to be baptized, but he forbade them until they brought forth fruits meet for repentance. That he baptized no infants, is universally confessed. I know not a Pedobaptist of any note that claims that John baptized infants. This is clear and conceded. But Alford and other Pedobaptist scholars agree with me that the commission was but an enlargement, without change of act or subject, of this first law to John. Therefore it was intended to be limited to believers, if any one claims a doubt.

2. Christ taught upon this earth three and a half years, and in all his public ministry, we find no instance of his practicing infant baptism. They brought them to him as they were wont to bring their children to those whom they esteemed as prophets and holy men, praying Him that He would lay His hands upon them and pray, i. e., invoke a blessing upon them, and this he did; and we find his disciples rebuking those who brought them, thus proving beyond question that they had not hitherto received infants to baptism or into their number. Here seems to have been the place for Christ to have instituted infant baptism, if he intended it for the practice of His church, or if it was already substantially in existence under another form or name, as circumcision, or proselyte baptism, to have explained the change of any former rite to that of water baptism, but he did not, and therefore he did not design to have such a practice known in his churches.

3. But then we have the *plain, primitive* teachings of Christ upon this very question. Nicodemus, a Ruler and Rabbi, came to him by night, to learn from his own lips the qualifications that he must possess to be his *disciple*, and a member or citizen of his earthly kingdom. As certainly as Nicodemus believed Jesus to be the Messiah of Israel, he did believe that he had come to set up a visible Kingdom upon it, and that he required all his friends to enter and possess it. All the Prophets that had prophesied of the Messiah, had foretold that he would establish a visible Kingdom on this earth at his coming. The Covenants with Abraham, and with David, secured to him both a kingdom and a *throne*, here on this earth. Nowhere in all the Bible is it so much as intimated that Christ has ever had or ever is to have a Church, or a Kingdom in *heaven*—or anywhere else than upon this earth. Christ's Church or Kingdom, in the skies, or in heaven, is a mere *idealism*—a fancy as unsubstantial as it is unscriptural and absurd. The idea has done more to confuse and enable false teachers to misteach and pervert the Word of God, than any one thing known to me. And the idea that the phrase "Kingdom of God" in John iii. 3 and 5 means a kingdom of some sort in the skies, or in the heavens, has wrought a ten-fold greater evil on this earth, than all the wars or woes, floods or famines that have ever wasted or desolated it.

It has been from the beginning the foundation of Ritualism of every form and phase. It was the first corruption of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity subsequent to the death of the apostles. It gave birth to the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, the necessity of baptism to salvation and to infant baptism. In every Pedobaptist creed or Ritual, you will find

this passage quoted in order to prove the necessity not only of the baptism of adults but of newly born infants, in order to their salvation, "the Kingdom of God" taken to mean the presence of God in the "heaven of heavens." It is a matter of profound mortification and regret, that some Baptists have given up the faith of their historical ancestors and learned the language of Ashdod and Philistia touching this passage—That Christ did not mean by the "Kingdom of God" here, the abode of his Father or a kingdom supernal, we learn from his own words in verse 12. If I have told you *earthly things*, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things." This kingdom was one of the *earthly things*, existing in connection with this earth, as opposed to something *heavenly*, not connected with this earth. It must therefore, have been that kingdom that had suffered violence from the days of John—it must have been that kingdom that publicans and harlots were entering, and which priest and scribe were attempting to shut up—it was then for the first time "at hand" that it had "come nigh", yea, upon the Jewish people and was there among them and offered to them. This fact admitted, because it is a fact, there we learn the only and essential conditions of membership according to the will of Christ its King and law-giver.

1. In every case, a birth from above, a Spiritual renovation of our nature and affections, makes us as much new creatures as though we had been reborn naturally. This is a prerequisite in every case. Then 2, in addition to this, and because the *birth of the Spirit does not introduce any one into any Kingdom that Christ owns as his*, or had any knowledge of—such an idea or fancy had not been originated in His day. In order to enter his kingdom to become organically incorporated constituted into His body, which is His church, a man must be born of water—immersed, baptized. For this, like the birth of the Spirit, was among the things denominated by Christ as earthly, because in connection with man and things—his earthly kingdom—that are on the earth and the effects of which were known, seen and felt *here*.

This declaration of Jesus to Nicodemus forever determines who can be baptized by His will and command, the truly regenerated by the Holy Spirit only, those really born again, and from *above*. Baptism is not appointed, as Wesley and Campbell and all Ritualists and Episcopalians from the days of Tertullian have taught to be the means *ordinary* or *particular* by which this new birth is to be effected or secured, but it is a Spiritual relation that must, in every case, exist and be enjoyed, before any one, young or old, is entitled to receive water

baptism, the only act by which one enters the Kingdom or Church of Christ. This one passage, rightly interpreted, is the death of infant baptism as it is of baptismal regeneration as taught by Catholics and Campbellites, by both the Protestant and Methodist Episcopal Hierarchies—falsely called churches. Christ, in giving his commission, certainly did not contradict his teachings recorded here. But finally, the design and essence of Christian baptism can only be fulfilled by a believer in Christ, and therefore, Christ could not have commanded the baptism of unbelievers, and mindless infants, since, as subjects, they would render his ordinance worse than a meaningless ceremony. The essence of Christian baptism is the profession of a personal, not a proxorial or parental faith in Christ, and an entire consecration to his service. Neither infants nor unbelievers can profess this faith, or relation, for it does not exist. The *design* is to symbolize the death, burial and resurrection of Christ, and personal union of the subject with Christ in these—death, burial and resurrection with Christ, and to walk in a new life. Neither infants nor unregenerate persons can meet the symbols of Christian baptism, and it was not therefore designed for them. This is confessed by hosts of the most eminent Pedobaptists.

Against this argument my opponent has no defence whatever, and has made none whatever. Admit an infant or an adult sinner to baptism, and what a farce you enact in the name of God and in the sight of all men. There is no faith in Christ, no death to sin, no resurrection to newness of life, no rising with Christ through the faith of the operation of God, no renewing of the Holy Spirit, and no answer of a good conscience towards God in connection with it. I conclude then in the language of a distinguished Pedobaptist, Dr. L. Lange, professor of the University of Jena: "All attempts to make out baptism from the New Testament fails. It is UTTERLY OPPOSED TO THE SPIRIT OF THE APOSTOLIC AGE, AND TO THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT."—*Infant Baptism*, p. 101, and in the language of Lange, the renowned commentator: "Would the Protestant Church fulfill and attend to its final destiny, the baptism of new-born children must be abolished. * * * It cannot, on any point of view, be justified by the Holy Scriptures."—*Hist. Prot.*, pp. 34, 35.

(1) "No religious service can be acceptable to God if He has not enjoined it."—[Dr. J. Brown.

(2) "There is not any express command in the Holy Scriptures concerning the baptism of infants.—[Stapferus' Theol., Polem. cap. 3, § 1647.

(3) Therefore Infant Baptism cannot be acceptable to God.

DR. DITZLER'S SECOND REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS :—Dr. Graves now is in the lead, can just select his own methods, New Testament, Old, or any. We will be with him in each, in all.

But now, when the Doctor has his own way, was going to explode everything in this question, lo, he simply relies on the light and airy weapons he had up before, called syllogisms ! Surely Dr. Graves knows that not a single one of these assertions is a proper syllogism, not one. He assumes as true a matter he has not shown to be wrong, cannot. Yet here is what he calls a syllogism: "Infant baptism is contrary to Scripture, infant baptism is wrong," etc., and then proceeds to make deductions ! Now he has just that one thing to do, prove that it is wrong, prove that it is contrary to Scripture. If he will do that, he has no need of syllogistic forms to enforce it ; we are crushed on this proposition the moment he does that. But that he has not done ; no, not even made a flaw in all my argument, not to name a breach. He has not disproved a single point, exposed a blunder or error anywhere.

He names H. W. Beecher's testimony against infant baptism as a Scriptural ordinance. Who has any respect, or ever had, for Beecher's theological views ? Not Dr. Graves or myself certainly, nor any other student or scholar. Beecher is a fine declaimer, good exhorter, but never knew what theology was, nor does he care.

As to authorities, the vast majority hold it to be Scriptural. Nearly all the greatest so hold. Lightfoot, Buxtorff, Schaetgenius, Wetstein, Witsius, Beza, A. Clarke, Watson, Wesley, Calvin, Wall, Alford, etc.

As to facts, it is far better to submit to our audience the facts in the cases, and let them decide, rather than to tell them what so and so say of it, when two to one, often five, ten, twenty to one, are of the opposite view. Hence the proper way is to submit to the people the facts, the Scriptural arguments, and let them weigh the facts for themselves. This has been our course during all this debate, and only quoting the authors where lexical use is called for, real historic records, or to offset where he quotes authorities. The Bible is the book to settle this question. Next to that, early history when it was so near the apostolic age as to be decisively forcible.

He says you cannot infer law. That is not in dispute. We can infer the meaning, the intention of law, infer our relation to, and duty under it. That is the point. The commission is the law. But everything is there left to inference. Go, on foot, on horse, carriage, cars, any way possible, go. Disciple as you have always been accustomed to disciple in the church, it is the church by its Head, Christ, that sends you. As to inferences,

1. You immerse wholly on inference. The word is not in the New Testament. You infer from your understanding of its import, that of its many meanings, that is the one to be seized on and held as the meaning of the law.

2. You and I are baptized on inference. The command is to the baptizer, not to the baptized. Yet by legitimate inference, we feel the force of the command.

3. It is you that rely on inference. We proved that there was a spiritual church, with infants in it, and they were baptized. You turn round and infer from John iii. 5, Heb. viii. 9, 1. That that church was destroyed. 2. A new church organized. 3. On radically different principles, leaving out the infants. There is where heavy inferences come in, not a word of fact supporting it.

The way each has acted on each new proposition shows who is satisfied, who not, with how they went. We did not fill up time exhorting.

As to his tract, it was settled in a former proposition. He has not dared to try to meet the facts.

As to express authority, the commission does not expressly name any class whatever. It does not expressly name men, women, boys, girls, children, yet you baptize all these on inference. Indeed, literally it would exclude all Jews from baptism. It reads, "Disciple (*ta ethnee*) the Gentiles, baptizing them," etc. Yet from precedents and teaching you infer it includes Jews also, and very properly. Yet it is all inference. Now why do these men so disparage inference when they are so dependent on it? He has not an express word for immerse for baptism, yet he will deter you from his church on an inference of his own. He has no express mention of a woman taking the sacrament in the New Testament. Yet he admits them.

He quotes Dr. Johnson that a disciple is "one who learns." So we showed that Timothy was taught, and "learned" the Scripture lessons taught him (*apo brephous*) from infancy. 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16. Hence, according to Paul, you can disciple infants. Hence the commission commands infant baptism, by his own admission.

He says in our baptism we profess our faith, and quotes Rom. vi. 3, 4, to prove it.

1. It says not a word about professing of faith. Hence he makes an inference on an inference, yet has no support for either.

2. He cannot find where the Scriptures say that we profess our faith in our baptism, nor anything of the kind—not even the spurious verse of Acts viii. 37

But he now makes the celebrated passage—"buried by baptism into death" now to be simply a profession made in baptism. He gives up mode as its import really—the "into" is simply a profession of faith! Now if this is "literal water" baptism, then it is saving, regenerating, for it puts us "into Christ, into His death," and by it we are "born together in the likeness of His death." It does not say baptized into a profession of Christ. By his own position they profess Christ, faith in him, yea, regeneration, before they are baptized. Hence they have already professed faith in him before baptized, from his stand-point. You see his views of this passage are utterly untenable—all wrong, and he has gone back on his former exposition of it. We clearly understood him to affirm that by the baptism of Rom. vi. 3, 4, people were "baptized into Christ."

And now comes up the old objection that it is not named in the New Testament. This we met already and may touch it in our last speech again. We pointed to the fact that infant circumcision was practiced during the whole of the apostolic age, yet not a single case of such circumcision is named or recorded during that age.

Eis comes up once more. It often means in respect, in reference to, expressing a mental aim or intention. Its primary meaning is "motion towards, to, unto or into." So Liddell and Scott, Kuhner, Passow, Butmann tell us, and all the facts and philology prove it.

We have now replied to all we deemed worthy of notice. Indeed, all these matters had been gone over before

I want to call your attention to one point more. God does not propose to justify *in* being a sinner. As soon as infants are old enough to know duty—know right from wrong, they should refrain from the wrong—never commit wickedness. You cannot deny this. He demands that we serve him all our days. Now, if you bring up children outside of the church, you not only assume that those years are to be spent among transgressors, but you throw the *inertia* of our nature—the indisposition to change we all more or less feel, where an outward transition is required—all that you throw on the

side of the evil one. It is the duty of all people to do duty to God all their lives. If all did so, the seductive evils that draw the young into sin would cease, of course. As soon as we are old enough to do wrong—be capable of *moral* action, we ought to serve God. All agree here. But we make this point there.

1. Our prejudices, sympathies, feelings, the bias of our natures at the tenderest age, in infancy, have a great deal to do with all after life. They enter into our successes and failures of life far beyond what most persons realize. By your course all is lost here.

2. From your stand-point you cannot tell just when a person should be baptized. You have a margin between real infancy up to five years old—between five and seven to nine years you do not know what to do with. You can never be certain just when people should—*i. e.* children—be baptized.

3. Is your duty in the church or out? You are to bring up your children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Now it does not say let them run in vice, learn evil awhile, then hope for their conversion. Bring them up, train up a child in the way it should go. Is this duty in the church or out? We believe our duties are marked out in the church, and surely to do those duties to our children is among the most important of our duties.

We turn again now to Proselyte baptism :

All the congregation of Israel shall keep it. And when a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it; and he shall be as one that is born in the land: for no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof. One law shall be to him that is home-born, and unto the stranger that sojourneth among you.—*Ex xii, 47-49.*

And if a stranger shall sojourn among you, and will keep the passover unto the Lord; according to the ordinance of the passover, and according to the manner thereof, so shall he do; ye shall have one ordinance, both for the stranger, and for him that was born in the land.—*Num. ix, 14.*

One ordinance shall be both for you of the congregation, and also for the stranger that sojourneth with you, an ordinance for ever in your generations: as ye are so shall the stranger be before the Lord. One law and one manner shall be for you, and for the stranger that sojourneth with you.—*Num. xv, 15, 16.*

Jesus answered and said unto him, verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.—*John iii, 5.*

And they asked him, and said unto him, Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet?—*John i, 25.*

“Also he is said to be regenerated and born again who is thus made a proselyte even as a new born babe, and all his former connection (of blood) is done away (passes away) or ceases.—*Selden ii, 785.*

We gave quotations in Proposition II, from the Rabbins—need not repeat it now.

But, is it reasonable that the Jews would not allow a Gentile to touch them, or any unclean thing brought into contact with

them, not come from the market place, Mark vii, 3, 4; not eat, Luke xi, 38, without baptizing, yet receive Gentiles without it.

"One law," "one custom," "one ordinance" shall be to Jews and Gentiles. This law was made before baptism was commanded. Hence all alike had to be baptized. Now the Jews baptized all proselytes, all their infants from Moses till the commission was given. Hence when the commission was given by Christ a Jew, to twelve Jews, one of whom so rigidly adhered to the Jewish prejudices that not for eight years would he go among Gentiles—Peter—they would carry out the commission as Jews. Nothing was more constantly thought of in connection with duty by a Jew than his duty to his children. Hence, in the light of existing facts it was equivalent to a command to baptize infants.

Again—by your own interpretation of the word disciple—to learn—it don't say what they are to learn, but we infer it is to learn Gospel *truth, duty, obligation*, etc. Now suppose we accept your explanation—that disciple implies necessarily to teach—that to be discipled one must be taught, why still we have the commission on our side. How old do you have to be ere you can be taught—taught most valuable lessons? Infants can be taught at two and a half, three, and three and a half and four years old. Then, by your interpretation, such are subjects of discipleship, and *you are commanded to baptize them*. Then Paul puts it in evidence, already quoted, that people can be, and were discipled *from infancy*. So Paul tells you then that the commission commands the baptism of infants. Moses puts it in evidence that infants *a month old* and upwards, Num. iii. 28, were put into a preparatory state of discipleship. Thus the whole Bible is with us on that point.

All the efforts of the Doctor, persistent as they have been, failed to break the force of these facts. We showed, in a former speech, that perpetuity of the church—the prophecies telling that it should exist forever. Christ was to "come to Zion." The Gentiles were to be converted to her. *She* was to inherit them. She was to adorn herself with them as a bride doeth. She was to be given as a covenant of salvation to the ends of the earth. If the old church of God ceased, all these, and hosts of like prophecies failed and never can be fulfilled. We saw from the New Testament they were most literally fulfilled. Christ came—preached in the church—used the term church in its familiar sense, both as embracing all God's family, and the *principles* involved in his church, Matt. xvi. 17, and as applied to a synagogue assembly or local congregation—Matt. xviii. 17-19.

We never find Christ organizing a local congregation. He

is reforming, restoring, repairing, gathering together the scattered sheep. He sends out twelve to preach. The harvest is great; pray for more laborers in the vineyard. He sends seventy more. No organization of any separate churches yet.

The truth is, had he done so, it would have convinced all he was not the Messiah of prophecy. Having spent his three years and six months reforming and spiritualizing the church, hunting up the lost sheep of the house of Israel, he is put to death. These now are the facts—the precedents the apostles had. No new church is organized. No law changing its membership is promulgated. Mathew x. he gave a commission to preach among the Jews, and he told them just what to do. In Matthew xxviii. 18, 19, he commissions them to the Gentiles, putting by his death Jews and Gentiles thenceforth on a common level of right and privilege. The apostles were to observe and do all that He had commanded them. But no command to destroy or organise the church and build up a new one, leaving out also the infants, is found. Hence it devolves on Dr. Graves to find where the membership of infants was repealed.

We gave chapter and verse for all we taught. In every point we gave plenty of plain Scripture from both Testaments. We go by this old book. But where has he given such? He tells you what this old father, that old commentator, and the other old theologians said about John's baptism; or of "express precepts," etc., but what does it all amount to?

Then Christ says of "infants," "OF SUCH IS the kingdom of heaven." It consists of them as much as of any other class of beings. Hence in Acts xvi, 15, 16, 33, Lydia and her house—the Jailor and ALL his house, were baptized. Nor does it say the jailor's house believed or rejoiced. The word "*panoiki*" is an adverb, rendered "with all his house." "It merely qualifies how he rejoiced. It is urged that in the house of Stephanas that they addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints." But this does not necessarily imply that each one did so by any means. Moreover it was some years afterwards that this language was used, and surely those who were infants one year could grow to an age to assist in waiting on the ministers or visiting brethren.

But we are perfectly willing to let this whole question rest on our hour's speech. The Doctor has not shaken it, nor can he. We call attention to I. Cor. x. 1, 2, where "all our fathers were baptized unto Moses." Now of those 3,000,000, thousands were infants, they were baptized. Thus the first baptism ever recorded is a religious one, had thousands of infants as its subjects.

DR. GRAVES' THIRD CLOSING SPEECH.

MR. PRESIDENT.—The last argument in proof that Infant Baptism is not commanded by Christ, is—

THE ADVOCATES OF INFANT BAPTISM REFUTE IT BY THEIR CONTRADICTORY STATEMENTS OF THE AUTHORITY UPON WHICH TO GROUND IT, AND ITS DESIGN, OR USE.

Dr. Beattie, in his Essay on Truth, utters this maxim of universal application. "They who allow themselves to contradict matter of fact, will find it no easy matter to avoid contradicting themselves." Page 170.

It was for this very reason that the witnesses suborned to convict Christ; "agreed not among themselves."

There can be no greater proof that a statement or theory is false when the advocates of it, among themselves, deny and refute every reason, or ground, they themselves are able to invent or produce to sustain it.

I assert that the advocates of infant baptism do this, and I propose to prove it. 1. In respect to the authority upon which to ground it.

(a). The earliest Fathers, Origen and others, who advocated it, only claimed the authority of *tradition*.

The learned Curcellæus declares that it is not an apostolic tradition, but only an ancient *custom*.

(b). Dr. Hammond, and his school, and that not small, derives it from Jewish proselyte *bathing*, which is only a *Jewish tradition*.

But Dr. Lardner, at the head of a long list of learned names, tells us that proselyte baptism is a mere *fiction*, and affords no authority whatever for infant baptism.

(c). Pope Innocent III., Peter Edwards, and others, not a few, assert that baptism came in the room of circumcision.

But, Drs. Moses Stuart, Hammond, and others, too numerous to mention, say, that the covenant with Abraham, and circumcision, afford no ground even to infer infant baptism.

(d). R. Watson, and his school, Eld. Ditzler added, maintain that the analogy between the Jewish Church and the Christian, affords an *inferential* authority for the baptism of infants.

But, Drs. Halley, Wardlaw, Williams, Manly, Alexander and Stuart, and a host of others, affirm that this ground is *fallacious*.

[e] G. Gibbs and others claim authority from the Lord's commission to baptize all *nations*. But many others are free to admit and prove that neither the letter nor the spirit of that commission, the only law for baptizing any one, will admit of Infant Baptism; but if infants are included in it they are all lost, for those that believe not shall be damned.

[f] Dr. Stacy and his school ground it on a peculiarly ungrammatical construction of Matthew's commission—*i. e.*, disciple the nations, all infants as well as adults, by baptizing them, baptize first and then teach them, and so enroll them as scholars, etc.

But the scholarship of the earth unite in pronouncing this a vicious treatment of the text, and declare with Calvin, Limborch, Grotius, Venema, Baxter, Doddridge, Matthew Henry, Dr. Adam Clarke, my friend's own standard commentator, that to disciple necessitated teaching on the part of the apostles and a reception of truths taught on the part of those disciplined.

CALVIN.—“The evangelists frequently use the terms *believers* and *disciples* as equivalent, and especially Luke, in the Acts of the Apostles.” “Christ orders those to be baptized who shall have given their names to the gospel, and shall have professed themselves disciples.”

LIMBORCH.—“They could not make disciples but by teaching. By this instruction the disciples were brought over to the faith before they were baptized. Mark xvi, 15, 16.” “Hence also our Lord commanded that men should first be taught, and brought over to the faith, and after that be baptized, Matthew xxviii, 19; Mark xvi, 15, 16.”—*Ins.*, l. v. c. 68, § 2.

GROTIUS.—“Since there are two ways of teaching, the one imperfect, by introduction to the first principles; the other by more extensive instruction: the former seems to be intended by *mathetewein*: for it means to initiate as it were into the doctrines and this is to precede baptism; the latter is pointed out by *didaskein*, which is to follow baptism.”—*Anno*. on Matt. xxviii, 20

RIGALTIIUS.—“The words of our Lord are exceedingly clear, who commands to teach before they baptize.” It is very clear that the commission makes no distinction between baptizing some and baptizing others. If it implies that teaching and discipling are in one instance to precede baptism, it implies that all are to be taught and made disciples before baptism. Erasmus, Beza, Castalio, and others translate the words, “*Teach* all nations.”

VENEMA, on Matt. xxviii 19, 20, says: “This is an excellent passage, and explains the whole nature of baptism. Before persons were baptized, it was necessary for them to believe the preaching of the apostles, *which* faith they were to profess in baptism.”—*Diss. Sac.*, l. ii, c. xiv, § 6.

Bp. BURNET.—“By the first teaching, or making of disciples, that must go before baptism, is to be meant the convincing of the world that Jesus is the Christ, the true Messias,” &c. “And when any were brought to acknowledge this, they were to baptize them.”

DR. BARROW on Matt. xxviii, 19: “The action is baptizing, or immersing in water; the object thereof those persons of every nation, whom His ministers can by their instruction and persuasion render disciples: that is, such as do sincerely believe the truth of His doctrine, and seriously resolve to obey His commands.”—*Works*, vol. i, p. 518.

R. BAXTER.—“‘Go disciple me all nations, baptizing them.’ As for those that say, they are disciplined *by* baptizing, and not before baptizing,

they speak not the sense of that text; nor that which is true or rational if they mean it absolutely as so spoken; else why should one be baptized more than another?

When Christ layeth down in the apostolical commission the nature and order of His apostles' work, it is first to make disciples, and then to baptize them into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. And as it is a making disciples which is first expressed in Matthew, so Mark expoundeth."

DR. DODDRIDGE.—"Proselyte all the nations of the earth to the faith and obedience of my gospel, baptizing them that by this solemn
initiatory they may profess their subjection to each of these Divine persons."

M. HENRY.—"By our being baptized we solemnly profess, (1) our assent to the Scripture revelation concerning God, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. We confess our belief that there is a God, and there is but one God," &c.

[g] Some claim the command of Christ. But others, and the majority of Pedobaptists, deny any precept or command for the practice in the Word of God.

[h] Some few resolutely claim examples in the New Testament. But by far the larger number frankly declare that the Bible does not contain either precept or example for Infant Baptism.

[i] Some think they may reasonably infer the authority from the fact that four households were baptized by Paul during his ministry. But scores of the ripest scholars admit that this would justify the baptism of adult children of fifty years as well as children of a few days and ought not to be urged.

[j] Some claim—Dr. Miller, of Princeton—with Calvin, that the infants of believing parents have a hereditary right to the ordinance by birth, and that such are born into the church (as Elder Ditzler holds) and therefore have a right to it. Others stoutly deny it.

[k] Some claim, with Eld. Ditzler, that infants are born holy or fit for Heaven, and therefore are proper subjects. But hosts of the more considerate agree with Paul that all infants are born depraved, the children of wrath.

[l] Others, with Dr. Coleridge, claim if they have nothing more, they have at least the silence of the Sacred Scriptures. and that is something. But their brethren are quick to silence them with the statement that this would warrant the baptism of bells and mules as well.

[m] The Latin Catholic Church admits there is neither precept nor example, nor Scripture authority, but claims first as for sprinkling the authority of the church, which Protestants are by no means willing to accept as proper grounds.

And all Pedobaptists are perplexed with this difficulty.—If children should be baptized, whose children? Presbyterians say of one or both *believing* parents. Methodists and others

say the children of all, indiscriminately. And still another, and as perplexing, whether they be the children of believers or unbelievers—of what age? Where is the limit, eight days, eight years, or eighty years. The New Testament fixes no limit, and none confine it to eight days, and circumcision was limited.

II. Pedobaptists contradict and refute each other touching the reasons for the act.

The more candid and thoughtful admit that Christ and the Apostles joined baptism to faith, and feel the force of that command, "What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." The question arises among them, on whose faith is an infant baptized?

[a] Luther claimed that they are to be baptized on their own faith, which God superfuses into them by or in the act. Others, and most others, deny it.

[b] The Episcopal Church baptizes on the faith of *sponsors*. Most all others deny this.

[c] The Presbyterians baptize on the faith of the parents. Most others deny it.

[d] Methodists baptize on whose faith? Elder Ditzler's?

[e] Catholics on the faith of the church.

Among the protestant divines of the sixteenth century, those who with Luther, held that infants must be baptized on their own faith were as much perplexed about the kind of faith it was, as they were by the authority to baptize them at all.

(a) Luther held that it was an *imparted* faith; (b) Leigh held that it was an *imputed* faith; (c) Bingham that they had a *passive* faith; (d) Witsius holds a *relative* faith; (e) Chemutius holds that they had a faith *in semine*, i. e., a seminal faith. (f) Prideaux asserted that they had the faith of the *Covenant* though not of the *Covenantees*.

Surely such contradictory evidence would be enough to *non-suit* any cause save that of Infant Baptism.

III. But the Pedobaptists contradict and refute each other touching the use of Infant Baptism and the benefit it confers on the child.

All the earliest Fathers who first advocated it—Origen, Cyril—urged that it was necessary to salvation, since it washed away original sin, and in some way secured eternal life as John Wesley teaches. There is greater agreement in this than in anything else touching the rite.

The Greek Church teaches this. The Roman Catholics say "If any one shall say that baptism is not necessary to salvation let him be accursed.

The Lutheran Church holds that it is generally necessary to salvation. The Episcopal Church hold to the same sentiment. The Presbyterians likewise do the same.

The Methodist Society teaches the views of Wesley as expressed in his Treatise on Baptism and Sermon on the New Birth.

The *Congregationalists*, Henry Ward Beecher—says to benefit the parents—and when asked *why*, “For the same reason I would make an ox yoke—it’s a *good thing*.” I challenge Eld. Ditzler to state a ground of authority claimed for it by any advocate of it, or the reason of it, or the benefits conferred by it, that is not denied or refuted by other advocates of it. Same end, yet what one embraces another condemns,” and thus they mutually destroy each other’s arguments. “For error is nowhere staple or certain, but fluctuates like the Isle of Delos beyond the skill of men or devils, to give it fixation.”

It is the most present desire of my heart that these considerations—this utter disagreement and contradiction among the advocates of Infant Baptism as to its authority, as to the reasons for, and benefits of it, the limitations as to the parents, and age of the children, may affect you as it did the celebrated Simon Menno in the days of Luther. I will read a paragraph written by himself.

MENNO, in the sixteenth century, vindicating himself from the charge of having become a Baptist, “through the efforts and means of seducing sects,” says: “To speak of a person’s being re-baptized, sounded very strangely in my ears. I examined the Scriptures with diligence, and meditated on them earnestly; but I could find in them no notice of infant baptism. As I marked this, I spoke of it to my ‘pastor,’ and after many conversations he acknowledged that infant baptism had no ground in the Scriptures. Yet I dared not trust so much to my understanding. I consulted some ancient authors, who taught me that children must by baptism be washed from their original sin. This I compared with the Scriptures, and perceived that it set at naught the blood of Christ. Afterwards I went to LUTHER, and would gladly have known from him the ground [of infant baptism]; and he taught me that we must baptize children on their own faith, because they are holy. This also I saw was not according to God’s Word. In the third place I went to BUCER, who taught me that we must baptize children, in order that we may be able the more diligently to take care of them, and bring them up in the ways of the Lord. But this, too, I saw, was a groundless representation. In the fourth place I had recourse to BULLINGER, who pointed me to the covenant of circumcision; but I found, as before, that according to the Scriptures the practice could not stand.”—*Menno*, *de*, p. 2.

At length, convinced that he had been “deceived with respect to Infant Baptism,” he received believers immersion.

I can but adopt the language of another, Sir Wm. Jones, I believe, who, in speaking of a commonly received principle of natural philosophy exclaims: “If it is not enough to discompose the muscles of a hermit, to see men thus notoriously contradicting one another, and all gravely pretending to authority and demonstration!”

Why is it that the force of this argument from the self-con-

tradition and refutation of the advocates of infant baptism is not more generally felt and acknowledged by Protestants themselves, when they discuss this question, seeing they yield it its full force on other subjects? Dr. Rush says: "Errors may be opposed to errors, but truths upon all subjects mutually support each other." Is not this axiomatic?

Dr. Alex says: "When men dispute against the truth, what one of them builds up is presently pulled down by the other." And writing against transubstantiation, he could say, "We find every party exposing the falseness and impossibility of every one's hypothesis but their own. Their greatest men confess the uncertainty of their own proofs, that there is any Scripture authority for transubstantiation."

Have I not shown that this is equally so of infant baptism? Like transubstantiation and sprinkling, it has no divine warrant, and men cannot agree upon the ground to rest it on. The language of Dr. Owen, when reasoning with the Jews, I believe, applies, with all its tremendous force to this matter of infant baptism. He says: "Every undue presumption hath one lameness or other attending it; it is truth alone, which is square and steady; men put themselves into an uncertain and slippery station, where they know not what to fix upon." The advocates of Infant Baptism know not what to fix upon, nor wherewith to relieve themselves.

(1). I have shown that it was not commanded by Christ.
 (2). I have urged that it was not authorized by the Scriptures.
 (3). That it was not practiced by the apostolic churches, nor by any one of the apostolic fathers, nor by those who lived contemporaneously with the apostles. (4). That there is no trace of it before the close of the second and middle of the third century, and then opposed; no really authentic history of it before the fourth century.—[See my *Introduction to Wall's His. Inf. Bap.*

It did not appear until a portion of the professed churches had adopted the pernicious dogma of baptismal regeneration. In that portion it alone continued, and it is a fact that it never was practiced in any communion, and is not to this day, except with the idea of baptismal efficacy; that it is in some way necessary for salvation. In proof, I refer to the Rituals and standard writers of every Church that practices it

It carnalizes the church. It corrupts its doctrine. The doctrines of federal holiness, hereditary grace, proxorial faith, and sponsorial obedience, obliterate the true and vital principles of Christianity from the world. It is the "part and pillar of popery." It has been for ages enforced by the civil sword. and the blood of millions of the best men and

women this world has ever known, has been shed for their opposition to it as an unscriptural, dangerous and pernicious practice.

Syllogisms.

V. (1) The Congregationalists assert in their articles, "That the New Testament contains either in the form of express statute or in the example and practice of the Apostles and Apostolic Churches all the articles of faith necessary to be believed, all the duties that Christians should practice, and all the principles of order and discipline requisite for constituting and governing Christian Societies, etc."

(2) I concede and assert first that Infant Baptism is nowhere commanded in the New Testament. No man can find a passage that commands it, and if it can stand only on that ground we may as well give it up first as last." The doctrine of Substitution for Circumcision is false, without one " jot or tittle" of Scripture for its support. If I was compelled to furnish authority from the Scripture before baptizing an infant I should never baptize another.—[Henry Ward Beecher, Congregationalist.

(3) Therefore, there being no authority in God's Word, neither command nor example in the New Testament for Infant Baptism, it ought not to be practiced for a Christian duty.

CARRODI'S SYLLOGISM.

VI. (1) "We ought to baptize to-day only such as Christ and his disciples baptized."

(2) At the time of Christ and his disciples *only* adults were baptized.

I do believe and *know* that there is neither precept nor example in Scripture for Infant Baptism.—[Bishop Barlow.

The Scriptures know nothing of the baptism of Infants.—[Dr. Hanna, Presbyterian.

"If it is pretended to be a law of God and part of a sacrament, we must have a Divine institution for it."—[Bishop Burnet.

(3) Therefore among Christians at the present day, not children but adults who are capable of professing "Christianity ought to be baptized."

—[Carrodi, quoted in Dr. Eyre's Bap. Sin. p. 18.

VII. (1) To practice for an ordinance, what Christ never appointed, and for which there is neither express precept nor example, is to work an abomination in the sight of God, by adding to the commandments of Christ.

"It is criminal to establish or countenance any ceremony of man's invention as a part of Christian worship."—[Dr. McLeod.

(2) "Infant Baptism is not taught in the Scriptures and can only be learned from tradition" (Dr. Lingard, R. C.,) and is therefore man's invention

(3) Therefore it is criminal to practice or countenance it.

VIII. (1) Any rite or ceremony that is totally opposed to the fundamental principle of the New Testament is not of God, and the practice of it is sinful and destructive of Christianity.

(2) "Infant Baptism is totally opposed to the spirit of the Apostolic age and to the fundamental principles of the New Testament."—[Dr. L. Lange, Prof. University, Jena.

(3) Therefore Infant Baptism is not of God, and the practice of it sinful and destructive of Christianity.

IX. (1) A practice that cannot on any point of view be justified by the Holy Spirit is not of God, and ought not to be practiced.

(2) But "Infant Baptism cannot on any point of view be justified by the Holy Spirit, and would the Protestant Church fulfill and attend to its final destiny the baptism of new born babes must be abolished."—[Dr. Lange.

(3) Therefore, Infant Baptism is not of God, and ought not to be practiced.

X. (1) That baptism which cannot fulfill the design of either John's baptism nor Christian baptism as instituted by Christ, is not authorized by God's Word, and the practice of it sinful.

(2) But Dr. Lardner says, "For whom was baptism appointed? For adults and not for children; for adults of all times—not only for those times. There can be no question about any infant baptism; if the Christian Church will remain true to the gospel neither the baptism of John nor Christian baptism can be fulfilled in respect to new born children."

(3) Therefore Infant Baptism is not authorized by the Word of God, and its practice is sinful.

XI. (1) If the infant children of Gentiles are to be baptized because Abraham circumcised his children, then it must be because they are either Abraham's natural seed or his spiritual seed.

(2) But the infant children of Gentile parents are neither the natural nor the spiritual children of Abraham.

(3) Therefore, they are not to be baptized.

XII. (1) If the rite of Christian Baptism comes in the room of circumcision then is the Covenant under which the Christian Church organized identical with that of circumcision and offers the same blessings only, and is to be given to the same persons only—*i. e.*, male children—who are Jews, for circumcision was given to a Gentile as such.

(2) But the advocates of Infant Baptism all deny this.

(3) Therefore, baptism does not come in the room of circumcision according to their own faith and practice.

XIII. (1) A baptism that is not the profession of a personal faith in Christ cannot be called Christian Baptism.

Having your hearts sprinkled, etc., the profession of faith *eis tonoma*.

(2) But Infant Baptism is not a profession of personal faith.

(3) *Ergo*. The baptism of an unconscious infant is not Christian Baptism.

Replication.

And now in concluding I have but a word or two to offer in reply to all Eld. Ditzler has said, and I do so for the reason that he has ignored *this* question altogether. His very first statement was altogether a mis-statement. He said that this is the same question we have previously discussed, and he has so treated it throughout. It is not the same question at all. It is an altogether different one, and Eld. Ditzler very well knows it. *This* was presented to his Committee and they flatly refused to discuss it. I personally challenge Eld. Ditzler to discuss it with me, for such a proposition has never

before been discussed on this Continent, and it has not been discussed *now*, for Eld. Ditzler has not even alluded to it. Has he attempted to show a plain command of Christ for it. Mark you, *Command*, COMMAND, COMMAND of CHRIST, of CHRIST, not an inference or *presumption*, or as his Bro. Dr. Bledsoe claims, and all that he claims, an analogy that justifies the practice—none of all this, but the question is as to a COMMAND of CHRIST. If he should in his closing speech intimate again that infants are embraced in the terms, “all nations,” or “every creature”—then he inevitably dooms the last infant on earth whether baptized or unbaptized to eternal damnation—for it reads then “every one of *them* that believeth not shall be damned. He has found no *command*—has not attempted to do so, and ignored the *duty* of doing, and therefore has violated his word to me that he would *discuss* it with me. I would here advise my ministerial brethren from henceforth to offer and accept no other proposition than this, but compel Pedobaptists to affirm that Infant Baptism is *commanded by Christ*. ♪

DR. DITZLER'S THIRD REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—Dr. Graves says I had infants out the last time I spoke. Not exactly by a good deal.

He urges there is no conscience in an infant. Hence again he pleads 1 Peter iii. 21, baptism is “the answer of a good conscience.” Infants he says cannot have this. We reply as we did on Proposition II, *eperotama*, answer, means, “promise,” “stipulation,” “a pledge laid down or given in advance.” So Wahl, Schleusner, Suicer, in their lexicons. Hence it pre-eminently applies to the baptism of infants instead of detracting from the right or propriety of it from that stand-point.

I regret the Doctor brings up the *ad captandum* that ought to be ignored by so able a debater, in talking about feeding babes, when discussing the Lord's Supper. It is unworthy, and shows the constant disposition of our opponent to fall back on the Tom Payne mode of discussion—deal in sneers. We do not give the Supper to people as *food*, but as a *memorial* act—do “this in remembrance of me.” None but adults ever partook of it from the beginning so far as records go.

None but those capable of remembering him took it at its first or second most noted celebration, and the words, let a man examine himself, do this in remembrance of me, etc., clearly enough show that adults alone are to take it. It can't be given in advance, is not an *eperotama*.

He tells us there is no inference to be made where positive laws are given. This is guessing again, and striking at random in the dark. Take the two positive commands on the Lord's Supper and baptism. “Do this,” etc. Now we have to infer who are entitled to it, for only apostles took it. Only males took it. Only preachers took it where this injunction was commanded. Yet from its design, nature and the ancient way of keeping it since Moses, we infer all the details about it. As to baptism, the commission specifies nothing in detail. It names no class, specifies no age. All is inference.

He says John baptized under a like commission. As he did not give it, show it, nor prove it, we deny it, and will again notice John's baptism directly.

He quotes John iv. 2, Christ made and baptized more disciples than John, though Christ in person did not baptize.

Do you quote that to prove that we can disciple before we baptize?

We grant that. We lose nothing there. Adults who have sinned are to be not only taught, but obey—heed the teachings that they may become converted and become fit for the symbolic use of baptism, as infants are under the “free gift.” We have even shown that were his constructions correct, still infant baptism follows of necessity. He has not pretended to meet it.

He introduces a new point—the law arrests no infant, he says. But it protects them, and provides for their rights.

John iii, 6, we fully explained, applies not to any condition of membership in the church to-day, but solely to proselyte baptism as a fact in the olden time. It applied to Israel, (v. 10). Yet infant membership existed in the church of which that language occurred. Hence it cannot be construed in a way to nullify a right it fully harmonized with.

He quotes Acts ii, 47, “added the saved.” But infants are saved. They are not damned. The free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. We, as responsible beings, have to repent and believe in order to obtain the benefit and become as little children. They are not subject or liable to God’s wrath, unless they grow to transgress and become guilty. Methodism has always been a unit there.

We care not for his modal adjuncts—they are not in our way. Not a line or word in either commission repeals the baptism of infants. He says if they are included, they are lost. They are just the reverse. If they are excluded by his. Mark’s commission, they are damned. All denied faith there—all who lack faith there as a condition are damned. He that believeth not, Dr. Graves urges, cannot be baptized. Infants cannot believe, hence, cannot be baptized. But he that believeth not here, is damned. That which here defeats their baptism insures damnation. Hence it was never meant to exclude infants, but simply those capable of hearing the Gospel; such believers may receive baptism.

He says a proselyte baptized did not have to have his grandchildren baptized. That is simply the dark-age feature of it long years—centuries after Christ.

Every Jewish infant was baptized.

On 1 Cor. x, 1, 2, the Doctor urges that dogs, bells, horses, etc., were all baptized.

Far from it. It tells us who were baptized. “All our fathers—all were baptized unto Moses”—as their lawgiver, protector and leader, their legislator under God. And to none was this

half so true as to the class of them who were then infants, for all the adults perished more or less speedily, save two or three. There is that in religious, symbolic baptism that bells, horses, etc., cannot undergo. Did not they take all infants into the same relation to Moses as were the adults? You say they were obligated to Moses as a leader, etc., etc. Well, did they not bring their infant offspring into the same obligation and under the same protection? Hence "all our fathers," not a part of them simply, were baptized. *Eis*—to, unto, into now indicates position—to the city, not necessarily into, at last. All right.

He makes a last plea for immerse. He asserted *baptidzo* was immerse. We proved it was not, but simply in late Greek only rarely applied to immersions.

We have now reviewed all the points he has sought to make. He has done his best, and failed. We now review briefly some of the many points we made. We begin by showing,

I. THERE WAS A CHURCH.

Heb. ii, 12; Acts vii, 38; Heb. xii, 22; Eph. iii, 14, 15, called "Zion," "house of Jehovah," "the Lord's flock," "my people," "the Zion of God," "God's witnesses," "Mount Zion," "brethren," "saints," "true circumcision," "the church."

II. It was Spiritual, based on God's covenant of Redemption to man. Heb. ii, 10-14, quoted from Psalms xxii. All this we elaborated and analyzed.

III. Infants were members of that church, their recognition provided for and established, while they received its proper ordinances.

Ye stand this day all of you before the Lord your God; your captains of your tribes, your elders, and your officers, with all the men of Israel. Your little ones, your wives, and thy stranger that is in thy camp, from the hewer of thy wood unto the drawer of thy water: That thou shouldest enter into covenant with the Lord thy God, and into his oath, which the Lord thy God maketh with thee this day.—*Deut. xxi. 9, 10-12.*

Blow the trumpet in Zion, sanctify a fast, call a solemn assembly. Gather the people, sanctify the congregation, assemble the elders, gather the children, and those that suck the breasts: let the bridegroom go forth of his chamber, and the bride out of her closet. Let the priests, the ministers of the Lord, weep between the porch and the altar, and let them say, Spare thy people, O Lord, and give not thine heritage to reproach, that the heathen should rule over them: wherefore should they say among the people, Where is their God?—*Joel ii, 15-17.*

And of Kohath was the family of the Amamites, and the family of the Izecharites, and the family of the Hebronites, and the family of the Uzzielites; these are the families of the Kohathites. In the number of all the males, from a month old and upward, were eight thousand and six hundred, keeping the charge of the sanctuary.—*Num iii, 27, 28.*

In Joel, 11, 15-17 "congregation" in the Hebrew, and

Greek is *church*—*ekklesian*. Infants that “suck the breasts” are members of it, and receive the sprinkling of the water by the priest.

We then showed from Hebrews ix. 13, 19, 21, how they “sanctified the church,” by sprinkling water on them. We then showed that in the 10th verse of the same chapter, Paul calls these sprinklings of *four diverse* kinds of elements—blood of goats, of calves, of bulls, and water—upon four diverse objects, viz., men, the book, the tabernacle and vessels of the ministry; diverse baptisms, baptisms diverse in kind, so the word *diaphorais* always means. We saw from Numbers viii. 7; xix. 13; 2. Chron. xxx. 16–18, how they sanctified to the purification of people—all by sprinkling.

(1), Hence here we had established our points. A church, (2), spiritual (3), infants in it, (4), baptized. Now let him give chapter and verse where, 1, That church so loved of God was destroyed. 2. Where a new one was organized. 3. On such radically different principles as that the infants were legislated out of it.

In the earliest records, such terms were used, including the ages given, in connection with the ordinances administered, as shows it a general and settled principle of God’s kingdom, and settles the force of house, household, in the New Testament, Gen. xviii. 19 :

“For I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment; that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him.”—Gen. xviii, 19.

“And if it seem evil unto you to serve the Lord, choose you this day whom ye will serve; whether the gods which your fathers served that were on the other side of the flood, or the gods of the Amorites, in whose land ye dwell; but as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord.”—Josh. xxiv, 15.

Numbers iii. 28—infants a month old and upwards here are put in a state of discipleship in the Church of God.

V Prophecies of *perpetuity* all assure its *continuence* for all time as God’s covenant for salvation—“a covenant of the people.”

Isaiah x. 20–22, 27; xi. 1–5, 10, 12 compared with Rom. xi. 1–5, 7–11, 16–27, and xlix. entire; liv., etc., etc.

“And it shall come to pass in that day, that the remnant of Israel, and such as are escaped of the house of Jacob, shall no more again stay upon him that smote them; but shall stay upon the Lord, the Holy One of Israel, in truth. The remnant shall return, even the remnant of Jacob, unto the mighty God. For though thy people Israel be as the sand of the sea, yet a remnant of them shall return: the consumption decreed shall overflow with righteousness. And it shall come to pass in that day, that his burden shall be taken away from off thy shoulder, and his yoke from off thy neck and the yoke shall be destroyed because of the anointing.”—Is. x, 20–22, 27.

Here we learn, 1st. That the unbelieving "stumbled," "fell," were "cast away," "broken off," (*thrice*), had been "the natural branches," who "fell," (22). If they repent and receive Christ at any time—the Jews—then it will be "receiving them" as from the dead, Gentiles brought into the church, are "grafted in among them, and with them partake of the root and fatness of the olive-tree"—complete unity; they as "the root," who were not broken off, "bear" the Gentiles, verse 18, 19, and converted Jews shall be "grafted in again"—"grafted into their own olive-tree," into which Gentiles were grafted contrary to nature, 24.

From which did Jews by unbelief fall? From what were they cut off?

We showed that John, Christ and his apostles never organized a new church, but reformed the church, enlarged it, brought in the Gentiles. All prophecy, all Christ's teaching, all his acts, all apostolic action and teachings harmonize in all this. Hence it stands unshaken forever.

We showed that from Moses till the commission, whenever proselytes were brought in, all their infants were (1) discipled, (2) all baptized. We proved this by the Bible. This, then, was the universal practice. Hence, when these apostolic Jews were sent to disciple, they acted as they had always been taught, as they had been accustomed. Hence the commission does not name any class of people as subjects of discipleship.

We met all his objections about bad people in the ancient church by showing that the same facts equally applied to the apostolic church and the Baptist church. Hence it fell away. We showed that Christ taught that "of such (infants) is the kingdom of heaven." That they were to be "received in his name." That the kingdom was to be taken from the Jews and "leased out," given to the Gentiles. Infants were in that kingdom, the unbelieving Jews were "rejected," "cast out," and the Gentiles brought in. Hence in coming into the kingdom, the law of commandments had been taken out of the way, which represented Sinai with its threats, and they came, therefore, not to the Mount Sinai, but to Mount Zion, yea, the general assembly and church of the first-born. Heb. xii. 22-24. It is the one church. The Gentiles who came into this kingdom came into the church of the first-born who are written in heaven. There is but the one church. Hence we have 1. The church. 2. It is spiritual. 3. Infants were in it. 4. They were baptized, and always recognized as members. Now he must get them out. His sole argument is remote, feeble, unauthorized inference. He gets rid of the

church of God, and finds not a Scripture for it. He organizes a new one, and not a line of the Bible shown to establish it. He leaves the infants out, without a word of authority. We demand chapter and verse.

They then begin to file objections.

II. John never baptized any children, it is urged, only believers in Christ.

1. John was not baptizing believers in Christ, as Luke iii. 15. 16, and Matt. ix. 14 show.

2. He baptized that Christ might be manifest to Israel—hence if infants were not baptized by Him it was for this reason—a very adequate one.

3. He baptized, obligating to repentance—they need no repentance, and that is reason enough why he should not baptize them, if he did not.

4. It is nowhere recorded that he *baptized women*—no woman mentioned in all his baptisms. So by *that* logic they ought not now to be baptized.

As John is claimed as the *Baptist* founder, they should restore primitive order, and reject woman, and baptize for the same purposes with which John baptized.

3. The apostles never baptized—the twelve—any infants. I know not, for,

1. There is *no record where they ever baptized anybody in all the Bible record.*

2. You are bound to admit that they still (Acts xv. 1, 2, 3; xxi.) circumcised infants, yet *no record* of such individual cases of infant circumcision can be found.

3. There is no record of a woman at the Lord's table, when it was instituted.

4. None during the Apostolic age.

5. There is no record of a child being baptized in the New Testament. Yet you baptize children, at eight, nine and ten years of age. Where is your consistency?

4th. But Paul did baptize three cases—no infant there. Let us see the baptisms he performed or was present with.

1. Lydia.—They baptized “her household.” Oh, but there were no infants there. Well, then, that is the only proof you have that they did not baptize them. It is an excellent reason why they did not, if you are correct.

2. The Jailer.—Acts xvi, 30-33: “He and all his were baptized.” Syriac: “He and all his children were baptized.”

(1) Oh, but they all “believed and rejoiced,” who were baptized. Not so. *Panoiki* is an adverb simply, and qualifies rejoice. Rejoice and believe are singular in Greek, only the jailer being the nominative to the verb.

(2) But there were no children there! Then that was a good reason for not baptizing them.

3. Stephanas, his household.—1 Cor. i, 16:

"And I baptized also the household of Stephanas: besides, I know not whether I baptized any other.

But, 1 Cor. xvi, 15:

"I beseech you, brethren, (ye know the house of Stephanas, that it is the first fruits of Achaia, and that they have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints.)"

2. They who were baptized ministered unto Paul, hence, no infants or little children! Indeed. It simply says "they have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints"—not that *all* did so at their baptism. Could they not grow up in years? Don't little children four and five years old assist in ministering, to help, etc., at times? Since Paul was there the youngest babe could have grown up to minister or assist in waiting on one in some important points.

You say there is no record where apostles, etc., baptized infants!

Is there any where Ananias, the devout Jew who baptized Saul (Paul) was baptized? Where the twelve were? Where the seventy were? Where the one hundred and twenty were? Where the vast multitude of "devout Jews" whom the people heard speak the wonderful words of God were baptized? Notice well.

There is no record or hint of the baptism of any Jews in the New Testament history of Christ, save those who had rejected Him—dwelt in unbelief, and so were of those "cut off," who had "fallen away," etc.

Is it a marvel then that infants baptism should not be specially named in the New Testament, in the light of these facts?

As to history, we need not repeat the facts. They are in record. In the Council of Carthage, A. D. 251, sixty-six bishops decide that it is unnecessary to delay baptism till infants are eight days old. Origen, born eighty-four years after John's death, shows infant baptism to have been universal in his day. He names it incidently often. It was not agitated in his day. Tertullian shows it to have been universal in his day. The efforts to get rid of the force of this testimony are astonishing. We referred to them sufficiently in the first speech to-day. Irenæus, born before John died, bosom friend of one of John's disciples, uses the word regenerate for baptism, which he and Justin Martyr do constantly, and names "infants" most prominently as those "regenerated unto God." All the space between Tertullian and the apostles is covered over—

the space filled by admirable writers, Irenæus, Justin Martyr, Ignatius, etc., so that infant baptism could not have crept in without exposure.

Such a change as its introduction pre-supposes, involved
1 An entire change in the doctrine of the church. 2. A complete change in practice. 3. Every change, however trivial, feast days, and many such things, besides the change in doctrine that sent the names of Corinthus, Basilides, Marcion, Montanus, all between the years 113 and 160, A. D. down to us as heads of disturbing sects, attest the force of this. But where did this supposed change come in at, and how comes the whole church to be as silent in such a stupendous change as the grave itself? It did not so come in. Infant baptism was apostolic.—[*Time out.*

THE
GREAT CARROLLTON DEBATE.

SIXTH PROPOSITION.

IT IS POSSIBLE FOR A TRULY REGENERATE AND ADOPTED CHILD OF
GOD TO APOSTATIZE SO AS TO BE FINALLY LOST.

DR. DITZLER Affirms.
DR. GRAVES Denies.

[DR. DITZLER'S OPENING SPEECH.]

I was opposed to discussing this proposition, because I have for years, yea, during my ministry, constantly advocated union of God's people, co-operation, and therefore in all those matters which one may believe or not believe, yet not endanger thereby the soul; all those metaphysical speculations, and all matters that are of such nature as that we may believe the one way or the other, yet equally respect God's word and authority—to which a Beza, Zwingli, Calvin or Bunyan may assent, from which a Kepler, Episcopius, Arminius, Wesley, Clarke, Tholuck, and Stier dissent—yet all be equally pious and useful—all such, I say, should be left to the liberty of conscience, the right of private judgment. They never should divide the church. Hence I am anxious to have all the great spiritual bodies come closer and closer together.

Nevertheless, I firmly believe this proposition, and with my church maintain it. The time allotted, one day, forbids a metaphysical discussion of it, hence I shall pursue the plain Scripture argument. It needs little criticism. The English version in the main will do us.

I may notice the following facts ere I proceed to argue the proposition :

1. It is impossible in the very nature of the case for him to

sustain the negative here—disprove the proposition, even could he show that no one ever had fallen. But he cannot do that either in the very nature of things.

2. We are safe any way—occupy an enviable position : for (1) if you could establish your negative, we are safe as you are. We cannot fall if you cannot. We stand if you do. (2) But if we prove to be right, you in error, you are then in a fearfully dangerous position, in that it may lull to repose, ease, carelessness, presumption and ruin. We have the safe side which surely must be the right side.

3. We ask in all good faith, did ever a valuable, sober, earnest constitution of laws, code, or body of men who were earnest, good and true, warn of danger, threaten, admonish constantly, and from fearful past examples, draw threats and enforce warning, where no danger existed? Never, *never*, NEVER ! Is the Bible an exception? But we proceed to sustain our proposition

I. BY THE HISTORY OF FACTS AND THE CONCLUSIONS BASED ON THEM.

1. The holy angels who had God's favor fell.

"For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment."—2 Peter, ii, 4.

"And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day."—Jude verse 6.

Peter introduces this strong language to enforce and give point to his words, v. 1, warning against "damnable heresies," even denying the Lord that bought them, who thus "bring upon themselves swift destruction." He further enforces it by the examples of other actual occurrences of ruin. Jude shows that the angels lost their place, and so bases his argument on the fact as a warning to us.

2. Adam and Eve fell, and Paul bases an argument on that fact also as a warning to us. 2 Cor. xi. 2, 3.

Notice here, the apostle "fears lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve," so those whom he had "espoused to Christ," to whom he was as a "husband" as a "chaste virgin," might become seduced by the deceit of the devil and "corrupted from the simplicity that was in Christ." We omit the fall of Solomon, of Saul and others, found in I. Sam. x. 5. 6. 9; xxvi. 14 vs., quite equally pointed.

3. *With these facts of possibility*, the following texts show how possible and dangerous it is:

"The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son: the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him. * * in his righteousness that he hath done

he shall live. Ezk. iv. But when the righteous turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and doeth according to all the abominations that the wicked man doeth, shall he live? All his righteousness that he hath done shall not be mentioned; in his trespass that he hath trespassed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, in them shall he die. Yet ye say, The way of the Lord is not equal. Hear now, O house of Israel; is not my way equal? are not your ways unequal? When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and dieth in them; for his iniquity that he hath done shall he die."—Ezek. xviii. 20, 24-26.

"Therefore, thou son of man, say unto the children of thy people, The righteousness of the righteous shall not deliver him in the day of his transgression: as for the wickedness of the wicked, he shall not fall thereby in the day that he turneth from his wickedness; neither shall the righteous be able to live for his righteousness in the day that he sinneth. When I shall say to the righteous, that he shall surely live; if he trust to his own righteousness, and commit iniquity, all his righteousness shall not be remembered; but for his iniquity that he hath committed, he shall die for it."—Ezek. xxxiii. 12, 13.

These declarations are so plain, direct, simple and earnest, they need no comment. It will not do to say it means "self-righteousness;" for the righteousness is commended, and held up as assuring life, and departure, death—spiritual, eternal death. On the contrary, *self righteousness*, mere *personal integrity* is held up as ruinous, Ezk. xxxiii. 13—"if he trust to his own righteousness, and commit iniquity," etc. Everywhere the Bible condemns mere self-righteousness.

2. "This charge I commit unto thee, son Timothy, according to the prophecies which went before on thee, that thou by them mightest war a good warfare; Holding faith and a good conscience; which some having put away, concerning faith have made shipwreck: Of whom is Hymeneus and Alexander; whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they might learn not to blaspheme."—I Tim. i. 18-20.

Here notice the "faith" made "shipwreck" of, is that by "holding" which "he might war a good warfare: holding faith and a good conscience." But he declares there were parties who "HAVING PUT AWAY" this "faith and a good conscience"—it was not taken from them—notice that—they "put it off," threw it away—it was not a future possibility, but an accomplished fact—they had done this—"certain ones," and the result was, they made "shipwreck of faith." What a strong word. He says positively certain ones did this, and then names two examples—"of whom is Hymeneus and Alexander." These had so apostatized that they were "delivered over to Satan."

"But shun profane and vain babblings; for they will increase unto more ungodliness. And their word will eat as doth a canker: of whom is Hymeneus and Philetus; Who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already; and overthrow the faith of some."—II Timothy, ii. 16-18.

Here parties who were of the faith and truth, err from it denying fundamental doctrines, and "overthrew the faith of

some." Now if a man's faith be overthrown, when we "live," "stand" and "walk by faith," how can we "live," "stand" or "walk" without it?

4. "And this will we do, if God permit. For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, [and have fallen away] to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame. But that which beareth thorns and briers is rejected, and is high unto cursing; whose end is to be burned."—Heb. vi. 3-6, 8.

Let us carefully examine this—one of the places so manifestly against our opponents, that Beza was forced to change the text in Latin, and make a rendering so false that he cannot be defended, and Jame's translators being rigid Calvinists, followed him. "For it is impossible"—there is my word—impossible on the one side supporting the possibility as the other—"for those who were once enlightened"—it was an actual occurrence—it took place—they "were enlightened," and "have tasted of the heavenly gift—were made partakers of the Holy Spirit"—how strong this—"have tasted the good word of God and the powers of the world to come, rich, deep draughts of grace—tasted and seen that the Lord was good—led into rich pastures, beside the still waters—after all this, the same tense aorist is continued—*kai parapesonatas*—and have fallen away—so it reads, and he dare not question it; and have fallen away [it is impossible] to renew them again to repentance." Here if saving them were now possible, repentance is named as a commencement, confirming the genuineness of their former conversion, and such an act of contrition would be a repetition, "repentance again." Well, why is it "impossible" in that case to be "renewed?" "Seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to open shame." Then as briers and thorns, so these are to be burned—lost. To a like class he refers—

(5.) "For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries. He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses: Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?"—Heb. x. 26-29.

Paul enforces this warning with actual occurrences also of a fearful character. Those under Moses named "died without mercy." Much more so now those who trample under their foot the Son of God—yea, and such person "hath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified—an

actual past fact—an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace.” Here again my proof is sustained.

(6). “Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him; let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins.” James v. 19, 20.

The same comment would serve many of these Scriptures. Here he may—“it is possible”—to so err from the truth as to need conversion, and such a conversion “saves a soul from death.” It was clearly possible then to be lost.

(7). Judas actually fell and was lost. He was (1) an Apostle (2) and preacher of righteousness, and so (3) with the rest wrought miracles in the faith of Christ, as Matt. x. 5–8, 20–22, shows, and (4) their names were all “written in heaven.”

“These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them, saying, Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not: But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And as ye go, preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand. Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils: freely ye have received, freely give.”—Matt. x, 5–8.

“For it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you. And the brother shall deliver up the brother to death, and the father the child: and the children shall rise up against their parents, and cause them to be put to death. And ye shall be hated of all men for my name’s sake: but he that endureth to the end shall be saved.”—Matt. x, 19, 20, 21, 22.

If Judas later showed evil signs so did Peter—sometimes presumptuous—then over confident, then “follows afar off.” Yea, denies his Lord—swears lies, commits perjury—yet recovers. Judas did not. Dr. J. R. Graves says in one of his works: Peter “was in a state of faith, and consequently, of justification and regeneration, while fallen. Peter was an Arminian. He fancied he was strong enough to stand alone—to keep himself.” Is that Arminianism? Never by any mortal was it so held—no Arminian so holds. But we are “kept by the power of God through faith”—that is Arminianism. All these twelve had it said of them—“It is not ye that speak, but the Holy Spirit that speaketh in you.” Matt. x. 20. Judas took the Lord’s Supper with the rest, Luke xxiv. 17–20; Mark xiv. 12–23. This we saw under Third Proposition. He is expressly named as dipping with Christ, while Christ uses the words all—“they all did drink of it”—the cup, Mark xiv. 23. It was “after the sop Satan entered into him.” John xiii. 27. Hence by transgression—by actual sin, “he fell.” So Peter declares, Acts i.

“For he was numbered with us, and had obtained part of this ministry.”—Acts i, 17.

“For it is written in the book of Psalms, Let his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein: and His bishoprick let another take.”—Acts i, 20.

"That he may take part of this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas by transgression fell, that he might go to his own place."—Acts i, 25.

1. David fell most sadly, but recovered :

2. Solomon, 1 Chron. xxviii, 9 :

"And thou Solomon, my son, know thou the God of thy father, and serve him with a perfect heart and with a willing mind; for the Lord searcheth all hearts, and understandeth all the imaginations of the thoughts; if thou seek him, he will be found of thee; but if thou forsake him, he will cast thee off forever."

2 Cor. xv, 2:

"And he went out to meet Asa, and said unto him, Hear ye me, Asa, and all Judah and Benjamin; the lord is with you, while ye be with him; and if ye seek him he will be found of you; but if ye forsake him he will forsake you."

In the face of the dreadful fall of David, Solomon and others, the fearful fall of Saul, whom the Spirit left, what can we believe but that man may so fall as to be lost, attended by such words as these, "if you forsake him, he will forsake you?" Suppose David had died after he had murdered Uriah, and for such a purpose, after carrying it out also. Will you say he could not die? That is fatalism. It assumes that a man once converted could live forever on earth, just sin on and God won't let him die. He could by sinning compel God to preserve his life. It destroys all free agency and responsibility. It assumes that after conversion men are perfectly passive in God's hand—have no free will, no choice, no action—are machines.

"But he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged of his old sins. Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure; for if ye do these things ye shall never fall."—2 Peter i, 9, 10.

This shows the possibility of falling certainly, and the opposite is the only promise of entering into rest. But Peter, having had such a rub himself does not stop, but returns with strength, emphasis, to this subject.

"For when they speak great swelling words of vanity, they allure through the lusts of the flesh, through much wantonness, those who were clean escaped from them who live in error. While they promise them liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption; for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage. For if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein, and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning. For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them. But it is happened unto them according to the true proverb, The dog is turned to his own vomit again; and, The sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire."—2 Peter ii, 18-25.

How can words be clearer—language more emphatic? He leaves no room for hesitation as to its meaning. He prefaces

it (17) with these words: "For of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought into bondage"—slavery. He is "conquered," observe, brought into slavery to the conquerer. 1. The parties had "escaped the pollution of the world." How? "Through the knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ." They are soundly converted, are regenerated, escaped the pollution that is in the world. 2. They fall back into the pollution again—"are again entangled therein, and overcome." It is an accomplished fact, a past act, a reality. 3. Their condition now, ("latter end is worse than the former.") Well, in the former they were children of wrath, "liable to eternal death." But they are worse off now than then, because so much more culpable. 4. "The way of righteousness" they knew (verse 21) "have known," was the way of salvation—God's "holy commandment"—they were washed." 5. The case actually occurred, "It is (has) happened unto them"—22, 6. He illustrates it by a "washed sow returning to her wallow again."

Now we assert that to say all of this means nothing—that such declarations, such bold and urgent language implies not even the possibility of being lost, is to subvert all Bible authority. It is as easy to explain away the awful threats about hell, the divinity and redemption of Christ, the promise of Heaven, as to explain away these facts and declarations. It sets a fearful precedent to semi-infidels and skeptics and dare not be followed.

FINAL PERSEVERANCE.

4. The threatenings, warnings, encouragements etc., based on the possibility and actual danger of apostacy are strong proofs.

(1) 1 Cor. vi. 1—We then, as workers together with him, beseech you also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain.

(2) 1 Cor. viii. 11—And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died?

Rom. xiv. 15, same, "destroy not him ["thy brother, v. 12, with thy meat for whom Christ died."

If Paul stood on the Baptist platform this "brother" was a baptized, regenerated man, yet he was liable to be "destroyed," lost.

(3) 1 Cor. ix. 27—But I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection; lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway.

1 Cor. 10-12—Neither murmur ye, as some of them also murmured, and were destroyed of the destroyer. Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples; and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come. Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall.

(4) Heb. iv. 1, 2, 11—Let us therefore fear, lest, a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it. For unto us was the gospel preached, as well as unto them; but the word

preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it. Let us labor therefore to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief.

All these warnings etc., are based on and backed up, by actual occurrences, as we see. Do they mean *nothing*? Surely not.

(5) Heb. iii. 12, 13-16—Take heed brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God. But exhort one another daily, while it is called To-day; lest any of you be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin. For we are made partakers of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end. While it is said, To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts, as in the provocation. For some, when they had heard, did provoke; howbeit not all that came out of Egypt by Moses.

Everywhere the promise of life is conditional on our holding out to the end. Does all this mean nothing? Then are all Bible warnings and promises a cheat—a sad delusion.

Rev. xxii, 19.—And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.

Rev. iii, 5.—He that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in white raiment; and I will not blot out his name out of the book of life, but I will confess his name before my Father, and before his angels.

In Rev. ii, 7, 10, 11, 17; iii, 5, promises of life, etc., to all who overcome, who endure to the end.

Rev. ii, 9.—I know thy works, and tribulation, and poverty, (but thou art rich) and I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan.

Rev. ii, 20-22.—Notwithstanding I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach, and to seduce my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols. And I gave her space to repent of her fornication; and she repented not. Behold I will cast her into a bed, and them that commit adultery with her into great tribulation, except they repent of their deeds."

John xv, 4.—"Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye except ye abide in me."

I. Sam. x, 5, 6, 9.—After that thou shalt come to the hill of God, where is the garrison of the Philistines: and it shall come to pass, when thou art come thither to the city, that thou shalt meet a company of prophets coming down from the high place with a psaltery, and a tabret, and a pipe, and a harp, before them; and they shall prophesy: and the Spirit of the Lord will come upon thee, and thou shalt prophesy with them, and shalt be turned into another man. And it was so, that, when he had turned his back to go from Samuel, God gave him another heart: and all those signs came to pass that day."

1. Sam. xxvi, 14.—And David cried to the people, and to Abner the son of Ner, saying, Answerest thou not, Abner? Then Abner answered and said, Who art thou that criest to the king?"

We have put in evidence all the Scriptures we need, and far more than is necessary. If these prove it not, we claim it not. Both Dr. Graves and I will rely on such facts and Bible dec-

larations as we can adduce in our first speeches here. We showed that *angels* fell. The purest of men—Adam and Eve fell. The strongest, wisest and best fell—David, Saul, Solomon and Peter, as noted examples; can man die when thus fallen? If so, our proposition is sustained. If they cannot, Baptist doctrine as held by Dr. Graves is all false, and hardshell—true fatalism established. We repeat, therefore, angels fell and were lost, Adam and Eve fell and were lost to salvation till heaven interfered, and all along examples are given in the Old Testament and New. Peter gives them, Paul gives them, Jude gives them. They are made the occasion of solemn warning to *all* Christians “to take heed lest there be in any of us a heart of unbelief in *departing from the living God.*” My proposition is sustained. It is possible for a truly regenerated, adopted child of God so to apostatize as finally to be lost.—
[*Time out.*

DR. GRAVES' FIRST REPLY

MR. PRESIDENT.—Of all the propositions we have had before us, this by far the most important. Former ones had only reference to the externals of Christianity, the visible tests and proofs of our relations to Christ, but this question involves the very foundation of Christianity itself. With respect to the former, we concede that one may err through ignorance and the influence of false teachers and yet be saved, though all the precious present blessings promised to obedience are lost, while all false teachers will be fearfully punished—yet concerning the foundation upon which this doctrine rests a mistake is fatal to the soul's eternal salvation. Conscientious honesty does not enter into the matter at all. The man who built his house upon the sand was as honest and conscientious as the man who built upon the rock.

Now if I understand the ground-rock upon which the salvation of any man rests, it is the Covenant of Redemption entered into between three equal persons in the Godhead, which contract originated the three relations now existing between these beings, revealed to us in the Bible—as those of Father, Son and Holy Spirit—the Father superior to the Son, and the Holy Spirit the inferior and servant of both—*i. e.*, the being who represented the dignity, rights and honor of the eternal Godhead, taking the name and accepting to assume the relation of Father; the second being, that of Son and servant to him, and the third person to be the servant of both the Father and of the Son.

Now to *discuss* this question properly, this Covenant in all its parts and provisions must needs be developed, and then all those passages of Scriptures which are usually urged against the security of a child of God explained so as to agree with this Covenant; for we both grant that the Word of God never contradicts itself. From an examination of the Covenant of Redemption, we can learn whether it is provided that all those embraced in this Covenant, and to whom the full efficacy of the atonement is applied, shall finally be saved through the power and faithfulness of God, or whether their salvation is conditioned on their own acts or good works after they have been justified, adopted and accepted in the Beloved. All can see that by the provisions of this Covenant alone must

all the Scriptures be interpreted, and without a proper understanding of the provisions of the Everlasting Covenant, I do not believe man or angel can understand the Scriptures bearing upon man's salvation—they will appear contradictory to him.

I have said this much, Mr. President, as explanatory of what I now say. Two days were originally allotted to this question, the least possible time in which anything like an investigation of this subject can be made, but by agreement one of these was cut off and added to the first proposition, and we have but two hours each to present our views upon this all important question. It cannot be discussed in this time. Every minister present is aware of this. We can scarcely glance at it—Eld. Ditzler has not presumed so much as to allude to the ground of a sinner's salvation—to develop the divine plan by which any mortal can be saved. He has only hastily thrown before us sundry passages of Scriptures that *apparently* support his affirmative, and of course all that's left for me to do is to show that *they* do not teach the final condemnation of a child of God—but I have no time to unveil the Solid Rock upon which the ultimate salvation of each child of God is secured. We cannot discuss this question at this time—and I do therefore respectfully propose to Eld. Ditzler a full discussion of this question with him at some future day in the capital city of my State, when every word uttered by us shall be taken down by two competent reporters and published as spoken. I propose this, not because I am not prepared *now* to discuss it for, as you may judge from these MSS. [exhibiting a large pile of MSS.] I was never better prepared upon any question than upon this, but time is insufficient, and I do it mainly because thousands and tens of thousands of professed Christians are in doubt about what the Scriptures do teach about it and desire to examine it—and if thus presented would read it when otherwise they would not.

With this explanation and proposition, I shall simply glance at the question—notice the grounds of the salvation of any, and meet as many of his objections as time will allow. I submit a few postulates:

1. It is admitted by all Evangelical Theologians, that every soul of Adam's family is *lost, spiritually dead in trespasses and in sins*. That every one born of woman is naturally depraved—and has no natural taste or desire for, but an invincible repugnance to, holiness and true godliness.

2. No one can quicken himself, no more awaken from this spiritual death than a dead man; while in this condition his heart is closed as a sepulchre; he cannot *hear, see or feel* a spiritual desire or emotion

3. If any are awakened, quickened into life, the Spirit of God must do it. The voice of the Son of God that awakened Lazarus and that will finally wake the dead, must awaken him to spiritual life.

4. This resurrection from a death in sin, this quickening of the Spirit, is the *first act* in the sinner's salvation. "You hath he quickened—made spiritually alive—who were dead in trespasses and in sins. "Whose heart the Lord opened, etc.

If this is not admitted then we have to do with a Pelagian, an infidel and not a Christian—a believer in the Bible, and not an evangelical.

5. All dead sinners are not quickened and made spiritually alive—renewed in the image of God and made heirs of grace and glory. All men's hearts are not opened so that they attend to the word spoken—to understand. *They certainly are not*, no man will say so—can say so and believe the Bible, or believe what he sees around him. Thousands under the sound of the gospel from this State annually, in their natural state of death, die and go down to hell. Who will deny this?

These postulates are invincible facts. It devolves upon my opponent as much as upon myself to explain any objections that skeptics may raise. To say that all are not saved because God *could not save* all, as well as some, would limit his power. It must be because in the exercise of His own sovereign will, and in the purposes of His grace He saw fit not to save all. He is no more under obligation to save any *one* of Adam's fallen race than He is to save the fallen angels. No reverent being in the universe will say that God is under any obligation to save the fallen angels, or any one of them. If He should see fit for reasons all His own to save one in each hundred, or one in each thousand of them, the rest would have no cause to complain. It would be an act of sovereign mercy in Him to save one sinner of Adam's race—and no one can justly charge Him with injustice should He save *none*. Now I will briefly advance my understanding of His revealed Word—and if any one has more light or a theory more Scriptural, I shall be delighted to receive it.

Before noticing his Scriptures I notice the three remarks with which he prefaced them.

1. "*That it is impossible for me to sustain the negative from the very nature of the case.*" etc.

If I can produce *one* plain, unequivocal passage of Scripture declaring that the true child of God shall never utterly fail of grace, that the once justified shall never be condemned—the

once saved shall never perish, then will I establish the negative against all the suppository cases and objections he has brought or may bring to support his affirmative. It is a principle in law that "no number of difficulties or objections unless they amount to an impossibility, affect a clear statement of fact!" Now I shall not only produce one such, but a score of passages, as well as the Covenant by which man is saved and the very genius of Christianity.

2. His second remark was that he and those who believe with him are safe anyhow, if I prove my negative, and safe if I do not.

My opponent has uttered many unscriptural and wild assertions during this protracted discussion, but no one in my opinion wilder or wider of the truth than this; for if he can establish the truth of his proposition upon the ground he has laid down, I mean because of the reasons he gives, then, as I understand my Bible, he is not safe, but is a lost soul, and all who hold with him as certainly lost as this Bible is true: for, he not only strikes the foundation from beneath his own feet, but he blots the plan of salvation from the face of earth. I as conscientiously believe this as I believe that Christ is the Son of God. If any man's salvation, first or last, depends upon his own works to secure it, he is lost, as sure as there is a God and this is his Bible. If Eld. Ditzler depends on his own works and endeavors, to secure the grace or remain in the grace of God, then he is this hour a lost man—however conscientious or secure he may feel, he is like the man in his sand-based house before the tempests and the flood came. I believe the majority of all who have gone down to despair from the "Churches" and congregations of Protestant as well as of Catholic christendom, have done so trusting to this very doctrine—that their justification before God, and final salvation *with* God depended in *some* sense, more or less, in their performing their part of the contract—upon overt acts, purely their own. Ninety-nine hundredths of the professed Christian world is embarked to-day in this frail rushbark of their own construction.

3. I say it may well comport with the *moral* government of God to warn those He designs to save from falling as one of the effectual means to guard them against it. If we cannot see this now, who see all things here as through a glass darkly, we may see it very clearly in the light of that cloudless day.

Now I will suggest three things.

There are but three conceivable grounds of a sinner's salvation. (1). By grace only. (2). By works only or (3) By a

mixture of grace and works. Upon one of these we all rest to-day, who entertain any hope of final salvation.

If I am saved, it is because I rest on the first ground, for on this alone I *first* trusted and on this I have builded and now rest all my hopes, and if it is false I am lost—for I have nothing else under me.

Now that this is the unmistakable teaching of the Word of God. I submit the following:

“For by grace are ye saved through faith; * * * “Not of works, lest any man should boast.”

In connection with which read Rom. iii. 27, 28, 29.

“Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay; but by the law of faith.” “Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law.”

If it is said that saving faith is the overt act of the creature, then read Eph. 2: 8-10.

“For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God.”

The *power* and *disposition* to exercise *this* faith is the gift of God, and therefore of *grace*. Paul explains this.

“Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace: to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all.”—[Eph. 2: 8-10.

In no other way could salvation be made sure to any of “*the seed*.” If the Scriptures teach anything it is that we cannot be saved by works.

“Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight.”—[Rom. 3: 20.

There is no article in the original—and it should read “by deeds of law,” of any law, moral or ceremonial.

Now Eld. Ditzler professes to affirm with me that we are saved by grace, but you noticed he did not say, and he *will not* say “by grace *only*.” He denies that we are saved by works—but his speech showed that he meant “works alone” for he did assert throughout, and it was the only ground he did present, that we are saved by our own endeavors in part—and for and in consideration of our own endeavors—works, and this places him squarely upon the third ground I supposed—partly by the grace of God, and partly by works, overt acts of our own, and here is where I have always understood Methodists to stand with all Arminians and ritualists—and all Arminians are Ritualists necessarily for they all subvert the ordinances by making them “*sacraments*”—“means of grace” to the sinner, and thus, they are fallen from grace by rejecting it as the only ground of salvation, and this is what I understand to mean by “falling from grace.”

“Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace.”—Gal. 5: 4.

That such a course as is indicated here, teaching or believing that we must be saved *partly* by works would be a virtual rejection of the system of grace for salvation for a system of works. Since not to take Christ for a whole and perfect Savior is to reject Him altogether.

Now I will strike away my opponent's sand bank that he rests upon, by one unmistakable passage.

And if by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then it is no more grace; otherwise work is no more work.—[Rom. xi, 6.]

The apostle teaches if we admit that we are saved by grace in part, then it must be that we are saved by grace altogether—without any mixture of works, or mere creature acts, else it could not be called grace—as it could not be unless all grace. On the other hand if we claim or think that we are saved, in the least sense, by some act our own, or that our salvation is conditioned upon our works—acts—then it must be true that we are saved altogether by works without any mixture of grace, else it could not be called works, as it could not be unless all works.

Suppose in passing through here I lost my horse, and I have only fifty dollars—not sufficient to buy another—and my brother, J. B. Crouch here, has one worth one hundred and fifty dollars, but he does not feel able to give him to me, but in the generosity of his generous heart he says “give me the fifty dollars and take the horse, you must not be hindered in the Master's business.” Now after I have left should he say he *gave* me the horse, he would utter a falsehood, for it was not a gift, and should I assert that I *bought* him, I would utter a falsehood, for it was not a *purchase* any more than a gift—it was neither. To be a gift it must all be given; to be a purchase it must be altogether paid for. I leave my opponent hopelessly impaled upon this third horn of the trilemma. If he takes either ground fully he is ruined inevitably. If he says by grace only, he surrenders his conditional salvation, and the possibility of a child of God being lost. If he says by works only, he evidently renounces Christianity altogether, and if he says, as he does, partly by grace and partly by works, —creature endeavors, he impales himself upon the plainest statements of the Word of God. Mark my prophecy, Eld. Ditzler will not attempt to extricate himself from this third horn, but will swing around upon it forever.

Now I claim that I have by the Word utterly refuted the theory of Arminianism and established the grand and glorious fact that if we are saved by grace, ours is an unconditional salvation, and that there can be no possibility of an adopted

child of God being lost. The very supposition of its possibility is precluded by the Word of God, and therefore all those passages claimed by my opponent as militating against the doctrine, do so only *apparently*, since he will not claim that the Scriptures contradict themselves.

The better in my next speeches to break the force he has given to all these passages, I will briefly sketch one feature of the extensive preparation I had made for this question.

It is one feature in the "Covenant of Redemption" upon which reposes all my hope of salvation. I prefer to denominate it thus rather than "Covenant of Grace," since there have been many gracious covenants made with man, securing many blessings, temporal and spiritual, but there is, and never was but the one Covenant of Redemption. If we can only rightly understand that covenant, with its conditions and promises, we shall agree concerning the salvation of those on whose behalf that covenant was entered into. In the proper discussion of this question, here is where my opponent should have begun. He should have either denied the existence of such a Covenant, which would be tantamount to denying salvation to any of Adam's race or, have shown that it was made with fallible, *sinful* man, without a *surety*, and therefore liable to be broken. Upon which proposition it would inevitably follow that no one could be saved, for such a covenant was made with Adam when innocent and holy as the representative of the race, and by the violation of it he not only forfeited his own title to life, but that of all his seed. Or he should have shown that having a surety he failed to fulfill the Covenant for man. In a former proposition (on I. B.) you remember he did affirm it was made with Abraham, and that Christ became surety to Abraham that the Father would fulfil His promises! This is absurd as it is novel, to say the least, and leaves all who lived before Abraham without a savior!

Such being the importance of this covenant, I shall give the larger part of my hour to the development and elucidation, of one feature of it, and if I shall be able to establish it upon its true grounds I will thereby not only refute his position but *prove* the negative of this proposition, and then I will spend the remaining time in noticing his *objections and difficulties* &c.

There was a Covenant entered into by the three equal Persons, or Existences in the Godhead, concerning the redemption of the physical world, considered as cursed for man's sin, and for the ultimate salvation of a population sufficient to inhabit it, so that the dishonor put upon the universe might be removed. There was a perfect agreement among themselves. In this

covenant the Godhead assumed with respect to each other and the race, the three relations of Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

That this Covenant was made by the Father with the Son, while the Holy Spirit became the efficient agent in accomplishing both the will of the Father and the Son, in the quickening of dead sinners, in sanctifying, sealing, supporting, and comforting, and finally, glorifying the redeemed by Christ. That there was such a Covenant made before the world was I know of no sect or commentator of any denomination by any titled Evangelical that denies—Isa xxxii, 6; viii, 54; x. Heb, viii, 26; xiii, 20. As in all covenants, whether of absolute promise or conditional, there must be two parties. So in the Covenant of Redemption God himself, as Father, representing the Godhead, is the party contractor on Heaven's side.

1. *In this character God must be considered as an offended God,* and his Government dishonored by the wilful violation of its law. There had been a covenant, called the *first*, because the first announced and known to man, and the first carried into execution, made with Adam in the state of innocency, and as the representative of his seed, but it was made without a surety, or mediator. Upon the fall of Adam, he forfeited life and salvation for himself and for all his seed, becoming corrupt and depraved in his own nature by reason of sin, and imparted this taint to his whole race—he begat children in his own likeness, *sinful*. If Adam had fulfilled the conditions of that covenant of works, he would have saved his race from death and the world forever more. His race was in him, he stood for it. God treated with his children in him, so he did in the covenants he made with Noah, Abraham and David. This is an important fact.

2. But God was to be regarded as entertaining purposes of grace and mercy for the lost before the world was. So we are said to be saved in time according to his own purpose and grace given in covenant before the world was. 2 Tim. i, 9. This purpose was an absolute sovereign purpose, and in its operations partial. Myriads of angels were fallen, the whole race prospectively seen as lost. He passed by angels—the nobler creatures. He did not take hold of the seed of Adam—which would have been all natural men, the world at large, but of Abraham, *i. e.* that seed to whom the covenant with Abraham was made his *Spiritual* seed—distinct, yet in numbers uncounted.

3. As party contracting, God is considered as representing the eternal and inflexible justice of the Throne of the Godhead.

That justice demanded that every sinner should receive the just recompense of reward. This cannot be set aside or compromised for. His holy law must be magnified and made honorable in the sight of men, devils, angels, and *God himself*. God loved the creatures of his own hand before Jesus proposed to die for them. But when that love would flow out, immutable law and justice interposed. God could not and He would not override and break down these to save guilty man. He could not, and continue to be God, erect a throne of grace, on the ruins of both law and justice. Justice required that the law which was violated should be fully satisfied, and the honor thereof repaired by sufferings and obedience, the former such as might satisfy the penal sanction of the law, and the latter the preceptive part of it, comprising all together the fulfillment of all the righteousness God's law demanded.

Now as Adam who had fallen could not undertake to do this for his seed who were fallen with him, and no one of his seed could do it for himself, it is evident they must die without mercy, unless a third party "could be accepted to become surety for them—should undertake to become to them a second Adam standing in their room and stead, as they lay ruined by the breach of the covenant of works."

I need say no more to show the necessity for a party to contract and stand surety for lost man. It must inevitably follow that those for whom he contracts, if he is a responsible surety, must be saved. Of all for whom he stands as surety, he is the Redeemer. But he did contract to save the seed of Abraham—believers. Therefore, every one of the seed will be saved. That Christ is the party contracting on man's side, no one will question who understands and believes the Bible.

When it was made, there was no one save the Godhead to undertake it, for it was made before the world was.

God the Father says, "Behold I have made a Covenant with my Chosen." Covenants, *typical* of the Covenant of Redemption were made with distinguished persons representing their respective seed. With Adam, Noah, with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and with David.

All these were illustrations, types of Christ, and several were called Christ. Christ is called the second *Adam*. Christ is spoken of as Israel. "Thou art my servant, Israel, in whom I will glorify myself." Christ was Israel's representative, in whom God will be glorified. He is called Jacob. This is the generation of them that seek Him—that seek thy face O, Jacob. Ps xxiv, 6, *i. e.* that long for the appearing of Messiah. It was on the occasion of bringing the Ark into the Tabernacle David had erected for it, and hence verse 7 fol-

lows. He is often called David. "Afterward shall the children of Israel return and seek the Lord their God, and David shall be their king." He was an eminent type of Christ, and the Covenant made with him was an undoubted and illustrious type of the Covenant of Redemption or Grace, and the benefits of that Covenant are called the *sure mercies* of David, for they were sure to every one of the seed he represented. If Sacred Scriptures mean anything, the benefits of the real Covenant of which Christ is surety must be sure to every one of His *seed*, and every son and daughter of Adam, that has ever been pardoned, justified, sanctified and adopted, that moment is accounted the seed of Abraham, being the child of God, for when adopted his name was written in the Lamb's Book of Life, and engraved upon the breast plate of the everlasting High Priest. Can such a one be lost?

These typical Covenants being made with public persons representing their seed, it is logically concluded that the real Covenant typified by them was made with Christ, as the head and representative of the seed he took hold of—Abraham's Spiritual Seed. What is said in type is principally accomplished in the antitype, and therefore the promises are *sure to all the seed*. And the Holy Spirit calls Christ the second Adam. Not because he had Adam's depraved and fallen nature, but manifestly because of their common office of Federal headship, and representation in the respective Covenants touching man's eternal happiness.

Adam is called the first man, Christ the second. 1 Cor. xv. 49. But only as the representative of the second Covenant—the second Federal head of his seed. Therefore as the first Covenant was made with Adam as the head and representative of his natural seed, so Christ of His Spiritual seed.

3. Adams natural seed bore his name. Ps. xxxix: 5-11. Surely every man—all adam—is vanity, *i. e.*, all the descendants of Adam.

So the seed of Christ bears His name. "Let every one who names the name of Christ," etc. "They were first *called* Christians at Antioch."

We must conclude from what has been urged.

1. That the Covenant of Redemption, called the "Covenant of Grace," not two but one, was not made with man—but before man was created. Types of it were made with men.

2. That it was designed and has been clearly revealed to be a Covenant of *Grace*, which excludes works as a condition of justification, etc.

Believers are justified and adopted immediately upon being

quickened without any righteousness of their own intervening and with the self same righteousness which was wrought by Christ in his fulfillment of all righteousness.

And this righteousness says an old divine, "is not imputed to them in its *effects* only; so that their faith and repentance and obedience are therefore accepted as their evangelical righteousness—justifying redemption before God—on which they are justified, but it is imputed to them in itself even as Adams sin" was. Read Rom. v. 18-19.

"It is said to be a better Covenant a sure Covenant to *all the seed*."

The conditions and promises of it, if time permits, I will consider after noticing—

FOR WHOM IT WAS CONTRACTED ON CHRIST'S PART.

This I suppose will be the Waterloo ground for the decision of this question to one of us, in the estimation of this audience. I wish especial attention to be paid to my statements that he may not mystify them in your minds by subtle sophism.

1. He did not contract *for the lost* angels, nor for all *men*. He only took hold of the "seed of Abraham," not of Adam.

If he had taken hold of the nature of the lost angels, they would all have been saved. If of the seed of Adam, all men would have been saved, and Universalism would have been the true doctrine. But he contracted as surety, Mediator, only for "the seed of Abraham"—the elect of mankind.

I know this is death to Arminianism, the natural religion of all natural men. They want to believe that they elect themselves, and then Christ takes them into his Covenant. The Christian's will has been subdued to the will of God, and he is willing for God to be an absolute sovereign—and in his own experience he *knows* it, if a Christian, and if not, he don't *know* it, and dislikes to receive it. We were made to love God because he first loved us. We elected or chose him, because he first elected or chose us. Paul illustrates the union existing between the elect of God, by the relation existing between husband and wife, as God appointed it to be, indissoluble, the wife becoming "flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone;" and I see a similarity in origin of the love that begets and cements the union. The wife does not choose the husband, but the husband the wife. It is not presumed that she loves and woos first, and begets love in the husband, but the husband elects and loves first, and wins her love by his own o'er-mastering love, and sweetly constrains her to love

and accept of him, and though subdued and constrained by love, she acts freely Here is man's sovereignty and woman's free agency, and yet she will tell you she could not help loving him who loved her so devotedly, and surrendered herself to him to be influenced and controlled by him forever.

We sing, Eld. Ditzler, and his brethren sing, and the Conference endorse it:

"Why was I *made* to hear his voice,
And enter while there's room,
While thousands make a wretched choice
And rather starve than come."
'Twas the same love that spread the feast,
Which sweetly forced me in,
Else I had still refused to taste,
And perished in my sin.

I. It was the elect who were represented in the Covenant of Redemption by Christ.

Proofs: They are called God's chosen—God's elect. Isa. xlii. 1; Heb. i. 13; Eph. v. 23.

II. They are called "the *heavenly men*." Cor. xv. 47-48, in opposition to *natural men*.

Every one of these that are made heavenly, Abraham's seed, shall bear the image of the heavenly *man*, Christ. Cor. xv. v. 48. To all these Christ becomes a quickening spirit.

As Adam's deadly efficacy extends to each one under it, so Christ's quickening and saving efficacy extends to each one he represents, if it did not, some would be deprived of the benefits purchased and paid for by the surety in their name, which is not consistent with the justice of God.

Ergo. Each individual child of God must be saved, when made a child, not at death. To say that one is lost, is to admit that all are lost—none are saved.

This elect was Abraham's spiritual seed, the spiritual *Israel*. Gal. iii. 16; Ps. lxxxix. 3-4.

These are those whom he begets with the word of his truth. Jas. i. 18, and are born again. Pet. i. 23, whom he knew as his seed with His image on them. Isa. liii. 1-11; a seed, every one of which *shall* serve Him. Isa. i. 22-30; which shall be established and endure forever. Ps. lxxxix. 3, 29, 36; in a state of happiness.

Christ is called—Israel, as he is Jacob—because he represents the true spiritual Israel. All his seed will be justified. Isa. xiv. 25; Rom. v. 18; Isa. liii. 6; as our substitute *all* Israel. Lev. xvi. 21. All the spiritual ones, the Israel here by faith who looked through and beyond the type to the anti-type were remitted and saved.

But in what condition was this seed considered when Christ contracted for its salvation?

The seed Adam as representative in the Covenant of works was considered an upright seed. Eccl. vii. 29.

But in Christ his seed was represented as a corrupt sinful mass—powerless to do good, or exercise a holy affection—laden with guilt—sinking down to eternal death under the fierce wrath of God and the curse of His violated law. We said, and mark it, unable to do a single act pleasing to God. They that are in the flesh, cannot please God, etc. The carnal heart, etc.

They were therefore considered as wholly unable to help themselves. Debtors, ten thousand talents, and nothing to pay.

Criminal under just sentence of death. Depraved in heart and corrupt in every thought, and unable to change, lost and utterly ruined. The lost sheep of the house of Israel. In the first Covenant Adam, the first shepherd of all mankind, not only lost himself, but lost all the flock. Christ, the good Shepherd, and of *Israel*, not of all mankind, will lose none.—(see hymn).

But they were in the power of the Covenant of Redemption “considered as the objects of *eternal sovereign* and free love.”

When God elected them in Christ, he became prospectively their Father, and also to Christ. He loved them with an everlasting love. John xvii. 23–6. The son loved and accepted the gift, Eph. v. 2, and consented to represent them in the Covenant, and thus each one of the elect became his child. Heb. ii. 13.

“It was owing to God’s Sovereign love,” says an Evangelical writer, “and mere good pleasure, that the elect, the seed of Abraham, and not others in the same condemnation, by the fealty of the first Covenant, were represented and contracted for by Jesus Christ in the second, that their names were put in the eternal contract, while those of angels and others were left out. They were the father’s choice, and that was enough for Christ, and should be enough for us. “Even so Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight.” Infidels may wrest this hard doctrine, more fully developed by Paul than any other Apostle, to their own destruction, but a host of the best and clearest minds that have ever lived on earth have advocated it—as Augustine, Calvin, etc., and Knox, Henry—and it is crystalized in the creeds of Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Methodists, as well as Baptists. We see here no universal Atonement or Redemption.

We have now seen who were the parties to the Covenant of Redemption or Grace, made before the world was, and for

whom it was undertaken. Here I need time to develop the teachings of the Word as to three additional features connected with this Covenant.

1. The characters Christ consented to take upon himself.
2. The conditions of the Covenant required of and consummated by Him.
3. The promises of the Covenant made to Him by the Father to be fulfilled by Father and the Holy Spirit to Him and His seed.

But I must say this, it was to do the *will* of His Father that Christ volunteered to offer himself as a party to this Covenant.

"Lo I come to do thy will O, God." It was the will of God that the works of Satan should be destroyed, and the world, redeemed from the curse, should be replenished with a righteous population, and this number, no more and no less, he sovereignly chose and elected to be saved, and denominated "the seed of Abraham," "the elect," the "Israel of God." "The sheep of His pasture." These Christ accepted to undertake for, and to represent in the Covenant and discharge all the conditions for their salvation.

"Thine they were," "thou gavest them me," "all thine are mine," "Of all the Father hath given me," etc.

These were individually, personally, known to the Father, and to the Son before the world was, if they will ever be known *personally*. If we admit the Omniscience of God we must admit this.

The names of each one of these, chosen before the foundation of the world, were written in the Book of Life, and as these were given to the Son, this record is called the "Lamb's Book of Life."

"The foundation of this Covenant purposed by God, hath this seal"—(*i. e.*, inscription on the seal). "The Lord knoweth them that are his." These were known and seen by Christ—he is said to have beheld his *seed*—to have seen the travail of his soul and have been satisfied with it.

Now Christ undertaking for these, consented to take upon himself a threefold character.

1. That of Good Shepherd, who must lay down his life for his sheep, and every one of them must be saved. He will lose not one.
2. That of Kinsman Redeemer—those he redeems will be saved.
3. That of Surety, and each he stands for is by him made solvent.
4. That of Priest, and while he lives they must live also. That Christ did assume these characters and consent to

perform the offices imposed, as the second party in the Covenant of Redemption, I will not presume to intimate that any Christian man will deny. I can but glance at the first character he assumed here.

No thoughtful Bible reader but has been impressed with the frequency Christ is alluded to, and spoken of in both Testaments in the character of the Shepherd of his people.

Jacob in his dying prophecy speaks of Him as the Shepherd and Stone of Israel." Gen. xlix. 24. David, Ps. xxiii. 8, addresses him as the Shepherd of *Israel*. Isaiah says of him, "He shall feed his flock like a Shepherd. He shall gather the lambs with his arm and carry them in his bosom, etc. Paul speaks of him as "that Great Shepherd of the sheep." And Peter as "Shepherd and overseer of our *souls*," and Christ himself delighted in this character. He says, "I am *the* Good Shepherd: the Good Shepherd giveth his life for his sheep." I am the Good Shepherd, and I know my sheep, and am known of mine, and other sheep have I which are not of this fold—included in the Jewish nation—they also must I bring and *they shall hear my voice*, and there shall be one flock and one Shepherd.

Therefore when Christ said in another place that he was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel, He meant the "seed" of that true Israel, given him by the Father, scattered through all lands.

We have seen that they were given unto Christ by the Father to be *redeemed* by the laying down of his life for them, as a Good Shepherd. If one sheep is lost, it will be a dishonor to the *Shepherd*. He is responsible for their safety, not the sheep for their own, they are powerless either 1st, to save, or 2nd, to protect and keep themselves. It being impossible for them to do it, they are not required to do it. The Shepherd does it for them.

Christ says, "I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will but the will of Him that sent me, and this is the Father's which hath sent me, that *of all which he hath given me* I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day" in glory and in his own likeness.

Now upon even this *one* of the *three* offices Christ has taken upon himself to secure man's salvation, I am willing to join the battle and rest the whole issue of it.

The Father certainly gave to his Son all that ever will be saved. No *Christian* will deny it. He gave them to his son *before* they were saved, and in order that they might be saved. They were all seen by Christ, and known to him, and *they* were so numerous that he was satisfied with them.

Do you say if they will only come to Him—*i. e.* believe on Him? Christ emphatically says “all the Father giveth me, *shall* come unto me”—for this was promised in the making of the Covenant, as we shall see—for all the Father gave His Son, He engaged to effectually draw unto him. It is upon this understanding Christ says “*they shall come*,” and that “No man can come unto me except the Father that sent me draw him,” the Father has undertaken to draw to his son every one he gave him, and he does not leave that one to come himself, for he cannot do it, the Father must draw hard enough to overcome his natural disinclination to come, and thereby effectually secure his coming to Christ; and if he did this in the case of all men, then all men would come. Now the only question that remains is, will Christ save every such an one, every one drawn to him by the Father? He does not leave us in doubt but declares upon his honor “I will raise him up at the last day.” John. vi. 39.

If any one of these is lost at last, was he ever one of “the elect,” was he ever given to Christ, was he ever a sheep? If so, he was known as such to Christ. He says: “I *know* my sheep and am *known* of mine,” “and the *sheep* hear his voice and he calleth his own sheep by name,” etc. John x. 3 and 14. Now of all that are lost at the last day, Christ will say, “I never knew you,” and this should settle this question in my favor. Should he lose one he would not accomplish the will of his Father, well known to his Son,—“and this is the Father’s will who hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should raise it up at the last day,” and who are those given to the Son?

“And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day.”—John vi. 40.

If I have *ever* seen Christ as my Savior, if I have ever believed on him for *one hour*, if he has ever known me as a “sheep,” as a child for *one moment*, then as Christ’s words are true, he will preserve and love me to the end, and raise me up to glory with him at the last day. To deny it, is to put a falsehood into the lips of Christ, and I would not do it for millions of worlds.

To say that Christ will ever lose a sheep, is to impeach his veracity, rob him of his power, and break him of his office.

Difficulties and objections amount to nothing against his express word. Ten millions beyond my power to solve or answer do not amount to a *shadow* of evidence. You must bring express declarations to the contrary from both the Father

and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and then what have you accomplished? Made them contradict themselves, and destroyed the world's faith in God and the Bible.

To say that an adopted child of God may finally be lost—one sheep perish from the fold of the Divine Shepherd, is to me a blasphemy heinous beyond my power to describe.

Why sir, if Satan can wrest or lure one from his hands, he could all if he wished to, and if I am saved at last, I would be compelled to ascribe my salvation not to the power and faithfulness of Christ my Shepherd, but to the grace of Satan that he did not want me!

But with the pages of His blessed word before me, and my eye resting on this covenant, and the arms of my shepherd and Savior around me, I can sing—

“Sure as His throne His promise stands
My God, my Hope, my Trust.
If I am found in Jesus' hands,
My soul can ne'er be lost.
His honor is engaged to save
The weakest of his sheep.
All whom his Heavenly Father gave
His hands securely keep.”

DR. DITZLER'S SECOND SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—It is the last day of our hard work, and Dr. Graves and I are not sorry. We are in fine humor, and discussing these points as men ought to do. The Doctor thinks we have not time enough—he laid away a great bundle of manuscripts he reserves for another day. Now that was sharp in the Doctor. He saw at once on hearing our speech that all the life was taken out of those manuscripts, and they would not bear reading.

As to time, if this proposition was so important above the rest, why did he propose to me, as he did, to take off one of the two days set for this proposition, and put it on the first proposition, giving us five days on it? He has forgotten, that is all. His proposition to meet and debate four or five days on this question of final perseverance we will promptly accept when he notifies us in due time.

He says there are three possible grounds of salvation, (1) By works, (2) Grace, (3) By a mixture of both. We agree with him that salvation is purely a system of grace. He then tells us that the Episcopal creed is Calvinistic. True. But Wesley eliminated all the Calvinistic articles, and of the thirty-nine gave us twenty-five purely Arminian. We say man "cannot of himself turn," but he can of himself refuse to receive grace, aid, help, and refuse to turn, and there is just where we are Arminian. We are passive in the work of conversion, but active in repentance and faith, throwing ourselves on his sovereign grace, finding grace to help in time of need. It is wholly of his free grace bounteously bestowed that the free gift came upon all, and of his grace we are enabled to accept it, "embrace the promises," "lay hold on eternal life." But we may "refuse," be "disobedient," "reject our God," and that is the capacity we have, and which capacity Arminians avow we have. Much the Doctor says we all here—all Christian bodies here—will accept.

It is "by grace only," yes, but if we do not repent, seek, find, embrace the promises, "hold fast the beginning of our confidence unto the end," we have no benefit.

He tells us Christ was the Shepherd, and God gave Him all who would believe. He ought to have added, for it was of the twelve the language was used really, "and no one is lost but the son of perdition." It does not always depend on

the shepherd simply, as the sheep may break out, and steal beyond protection. Nor are we to make illustrations go on all fours.

He says the only question is, Will the converted be left to themselves? Grace, he says, is continued. "God never disinherits a child." Do children never disinherit themselves by leaving parents, rejecting their authority and assuming to act for themselves? They are never disinherited, eh? Are not their names and part taken out of the book of life, "and out of the holy city, and from the things (promised) written in this book?" Rev. xxii. 19. If that is not disinheriting what is?

He aims to offset my argument on Adam, Eve and the angels an the score that they were under the covenant of works, hence failing therein, they fell. We answer,

1. If that were so, it holds not good, for if under a covenant of works, failure to do the work lost them their place, so, if under a covenant of grace through faith, unbelief, disbelief, would lose them the grace—they would "fall from grace." Paul expressly tells us of parties who had "fallen from grace." We see the reason is wrong the position untenable.

2. It is not in proof that they were under a system of works. It was as necessary for the angels to believe; for Adam and Eve to believe as it is for us. Want of faith in them would prove disastrous.

He replies to my argument on Ezekiel—an argument of Scripture so clear, simple, direct, emphatic, that, it can't be misunderstood well—that by "righteous," we are simply to understand honest, etc. They were honest men! He says they were under the covenant of works! What does the good Doctor mean by this? Was Ezekiel then urging them all to continue in the covenant of works that they might live? Were men saved that way then—justified—made righteous that way then—in David's, Abraham's, or Ezekiel's day? Hear Paul, Rom. iv, 2-9: "If Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory, but not before God. For what saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it"—believing God—"was counted to him for righteousness." Then the conclusion is drawn, "To him that worketh not, but believeth in him that justified the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." There is the way they became righteous. How is it in David's day? Paul continues:

"Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works. Saying, blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin. Cometh this blessedness

then upon the circumcision only, or upon the uncircumcision also? for we say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness."—Romans, xiv, 6-9.

Here you see "righteousness" was the effect of faith, believing, the system of grace the Doctor told us of in his first speech on this proposition, and it was obtained "without works." And Abraham was thus justified, that he might be the father of all them that believe, that righteousness might be imputed to them also. Hence, when we are justified by faith, under a system of Grace, we "walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham," v. 12, "who is the father of us all," v. 16. To test this further, read Isaiah i, 11-16; Micah vi, 6; Psalms li, 1-10; Deut. vi, 4, 5, compared with Mark xii, 28-33, as samples of the spiritual force of their religion. In former propositions we discussed that matter enough. It is clear from Ezekiel, quoted in full in our opening speech this morning, that a truly regenerate man may fall away and be lost.

He tells us Jesus "is security." He undertook the salvation of believers. Yes, "all who believe," and he will save all who believe. But unless they believe—not *did* believe, but *believe*—present tense—all such he saves from sin, and will save from hell.

He undertook the salvation of all men, if they will accept the terms, abide by them. It is wholly their fault if they are not saved. He never undertook to save any morally responsible being unconditionally. He gives the needed grace, they must accept, receive, live in it, "abide in Him," else they are cut off, cast forth, wither, John xv. Acts ii, 47, "the saved," as it is in the Greek, is quoted. But they surely were not saved in heaven, but from their sins in that case.

"Not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my father which is in heaven."—Matt. vii, 2

He quotes the words addressed to the rejected or lost of Matt. vii, 23, as if every lost one never had known God, never been pardoned, etc. But simply says it of those who never had known God, as the very preceding verse showed. They only said "Lord, Lord," as contrasted with those who do the will of his Father in heaven—v. 21, 22.

John x, 28—"Neither shall any pluck them out of my hand." We endorse all that. If they could we would have no show at all. If the devil could pluck us out of his hand, we would have no chance. But we are moral agents. We are not passive machines. We may escape out of his hands. Grievous wolves may enter in, and devour all who wander from their

shepherd. These wolves will enter in, "not sparing the flock." Acts xx, 27, 28.

He argues that if the devil could he would take all. It implies greater strength in him than in God to do so. Nay he would have to "overcome the power of God." Now it is a fact

1. That Satan did overcome, seduce, destroy angels. Was that overcoming the power of God? It was not a question of power, but of man's free action and choice, in yielding to bad influences, or of angels doing so.

2. Adam was overcome, and it was not a question of power, but of choice, he yielding to seductive influences. In all this we learn,

3. That it is not for the good of the moral and intellectual universe that man be deprived of the value, pleasure, and dignity of choice—of free agency. In it alone is there such a type of intellectual and moral dignity and grandeur, and such capacity for happiness and bliss as is pleasing to God, and compatible with his wisdom. The qualification for real mental and moral happiness is freedom of choice. Nay, we hesitate not to say there cannot exist man or angel without it. There could not be created a being of intellect, emotion, desires, and sympathies, without this. The absence of choice, freedom, is the absence of all intellectual force, moral quality, or capacity for pleasure.

4. The position of Dr. Graves destroys all responsibility and individuality in man. The absence of choice, of freedom and corresponding responsibility for his action, robs all actions of moral tone. There is no morality in his doings or motives, aims. His actions have no more of moral quality than the noise of a wheel or the sound of an anvil.

You can see the force of this, too, in the illustration of my brother. He hides the diamond in a safe—it is shut up in security—safe. But,

1. The diamond is purely passive, has no volition. Its intrinsic value is in itself. But the Christian's value is in being abroad, doing good, in conflict with the world and its dangers. Hence he must watch and pray, and guard against the evils of the world.

2. We are not passively put away in security, but are to abide in Him, walk in Him, live in Him. All the Scriptures on the subject show that it is perfectly and constantly possible for us to "fall away," "stumble," lose our crown, make shipwreck of faith, fail to abide in Him—be cast forth and wither.

In no instance is absolute safety or security spoken of as belonging to us. In all cases it is conditional on our adherence

to Christ through an act of living faith. This faith can die out in the heart; a heart of unbelief can come in, and we make shipwreck of faith.

Paul tells (1 Tim. v. 8-12) of those who "denied the faith," of others who were believers who now from their course are fallen, "having damnation, because they have cast off their first faith." Yea, v. 15, "Some are already turned aside after Satan." Where is the safe now? Are they shut up in it?

We wish you to take in view the points we made. 1. It cannot be proved that a man may not fall away so as to be lost. It is nowhere so stated—nowhere so argued in Scripture. 2. We are in all parts of the Scriptures warned, admonished, counselled in every possible way against the great danger of apostacy. Not only so, but it is constantly recurring. It is in all parts of the Bible. To give it still more force Paul and Peter tell of the fall of angels and of our parents in the garden, and base their warning to us on these very impressive examples. Not content with all that, they tell us of the overthrow in the wilderness, and thus enforce their admonitions. Now we say it is simply monstrous that all this could be where there was no possible danger. Let us look at it closely here. We affirm—deny it if you can—that no moralist or wise legislator ever holds up threats and constantly warns dangers that do not and cannot exist. But you make God do this thing, and under such circumstances and illustrations—pointing to actual cases of the most fearful and impressive kind, where the parties did fall and into utter ruin and loss—Angels, Adam and Eve, and those in the wilderness, yet tell me it implies nothing!!

Again: Is it truthful, is it honest, to tell of a great and constant danger, and warn against it, and from the first lessons of the Bible to the very last chapter in it, where we are warned that if we abridge his word he will take our part out of the Lamb's Book of Life, our part of the Holy City, &c., when there is no such danger?

Again: Is it safe, is it wise in us thus to discredit the solemn assurances, warnings and fearful threats of all the inspired penmen, where their language is so pointed and clear? Can we wonder if Universalists and skeptics explain away the idea of hell, and tell us that all those warnings, illustrations and declarations are mere "scare crows?" It is not safe, it is not wise. On the contrary, it sets precedents of the most dangerous kind, and they will be followed by evil consequences.

We have avoided any metaphysical arguments on this question, because one day would not allow of such a course. We

have appealed to the plain Scriptures, with but little of criticism even; for it does not need it. Then when you come to the strong arguments Paul and Peter use, each following up with example in the church in their day who had fallen—who were delivered over to the devil whose latter condition was worse than the former before they were converted—when these facts are set forth, and made the grounds of additional and tremendous appeal, it is a fearful impeachment of divine veracity, sincerity and honesty to assert that there exists no danger—no possibility of a truly regenerate man so falling away as to be finally lost.

We call your attention to a few of these already put in evidence, for it is useless to add more. If all those are untrue, so are the rest. If all these are mere scare-crows, so are the rest, and adding multitudes would do no good.

“For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries. He that despised Moses’ law died without mercy under two or three witnesses: of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace? For we know him that hath said, Vengeance *belongeth* unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord. And again, The Lord shall judge his people.”—Hebrews x. 26–30.

Here now Paul advises, verse 23, to “hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering.” He tells them they were “illuminated,” and what wonderful sufferings they had endured, verses 32–34. He warns them, verse 35, not to “cast away” their confidence which hath great recompense of reward. Hence we see what excellent Christians they were whom he addresses. Yet such people are told they may “sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth.” Yea he may tread “under foot the Son of God,” and “count the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing,” and he “hath done despite unto the Spirit of Grace,” where is the safe all that time? The safe that secures against damnation must be a safe that secures against such fearful disorder as this. Hence he asks “of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he [who thus acts] be thought worthy,” in view of God’s just indignation? Does all this mean nothing? If this can be explained away, so can the threats and strong declarations as to the damned, and the hopes of the righteous.

Let us select again 2 Peter, ii. 4, 15, 19–22 inclusive. First he tells us thus: For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, etc., and spared not the old world,”

etc., so evil doers shall perish now—those who “have forsaken the right way, and are gone astray, following the way of Balaam.” After this solemn preparation of the mind to be rightly impressed and admonished, he then says:

“While they promise them liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption: for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage. For if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein, and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning. For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them. But it is happened unto them according to the true proverb, The dog is turned to his own vomit again; and, The sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire.”—II Pet. ii. 19-22.

Here you see the men are so gone astray as to offer liberty to others, while they are themselves the servants of corruption. “They allure through the lusts of the flesh, through much wantonness, *those who were clean escaped* from them who live in error,” v. 18. He then urges, “of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought into bondage,” v. 9. Here the party had “clean escaped from them who live in error” or sin. Yet they are “overcome,” and “brought into bondage.” It is not the power of God that is overcome. It is the righteous—the one who had clean escaped from sin. He then tells us, v. 20, they escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ. They become entangled in the world again, “and overcome.” He tells us of all such “that their latter end is worse with them than the beginning.” Yea,

“For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them. But it is happened unto them according to the true proverb, The dog is turned to his own vomit again; and, The sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire.”—II Peter, ii. 21-22.

Such is the testimony of Peter who had some experience in being sifted. Does all this mean nothing? Could an inspired man of God thus write, speaking too, so earnestly to man’s *consciousness*, to the deepseated eye of the soul, telling him the very truth he feels in the depths of his soul, in the frailties, the dangerous surroundings of life, and yet mean nothing at all? It cannot be—no, it cannot be.—[*Time out.*]

DR. GRAVES' SECOND REPLY

MR. PRESIDENT.—As we meet again to *fully* discuss this question, that above every other interests me, I will, in the two remaining half hours available to me, 1. Present Eld. Ditzler with plain, positive, unequivocal passages that establish, beyond controversy, the negative of the proposition, and 2. Notice, so far as time will allow, all the passages he may bring forward, that *apparently* militate against the positive ones.

One of the promises of the Covenant of Redemption, made by the father to the people he gave to his son.

1 "I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: and they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to the unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more."—Heb. viii. 10-12.

Now two things are provided for in this Covenant. 1. That God will never turn away from any member of the Covenant, and 2. That no one ever interested in it shall depart from God to be lost.

2 "And I will make an everlasting covenant with them, that *I will not turn away from them*, to do them good; but I will put my fear in their heart, that *they shall not depart from me*,"—Jer. xxxii. 40.

To add to this, seems like attempting to add strength to the foundation of the earth, or the very throne of God. But we have to combat with a singular species of religious infidelity

3 "Likewise, I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth."—Luke xv. 10.

How can this be, if there is a possibility of that sinner falling from grace in six months, six weeks, or six days? Would there not be folly in such joy? Would it not be premature? If Eld. Ditzler's position is true, that sinner might have fallen from grace before the angel that started with the news had reached heaven, if he should chance to be detained as long as the angel was that God sent to answer Daniel's prayer—twenty-one days. What then! Angels rejoicing over one they thought was saved, but who might at the same moment, be cursing God!

No, if there is joy in the presence of the angels when a sinner truly repents, we may know that that sinner is that *moment* truly saved; and the angels may as well rejoice then,

as when they see him *glorified*—for his repentance was a proof of his being called of God, and no one ever was called who will not be glorified.

4 “And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to *his* purpose.”—Rom. viii. 28.

Those who are called of God will love God, and love him to the end, and nothing will work for their destruction, but for their good.

5 “For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate *to be* conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren.”—Rom. viii. 29.

God did not predestinate them because they were, or after they were, conformed, but in order that they might be conformed to the image of his Son.

6 “Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called : and whom he called, them he also justified : and whom he justified, them he also glorified.”—Rom. viii. 30.

God, in all these acts, moves first. No one ever was justified by faith for one moment, who was not predestinated and called, and no one was ever justified for one moment, who will not be finally glorified : and this settles the question.

7 “What shall we then say to these things ? If God *be* for us, who *can be* against us ?”—Rom. viii. 31.

I say glory to God in the highest, for this overcoming grace. I say no power on earth or under the earth can be against us successfully—triumphantly. We will, we must, be more than conquerors through Him who loved us. What will Eld. Ditzler say to these things ? He will try to do them all away, and say that we are left in our own power, and to our own keeping, and that we can be, and are in the greatest danger of being, against ourselves to our own ruin ! He will deny that our salvation depends upon the love of Christ and of God being *continued* to us, and the continuous keeping of the Almighty power of God, and insist that it depends upon our continuing our love to God, and our keeping ourselves, not by an implanted and imperishable faith, which is the gift of God, but by a perishable faith—the mere overt act of a weak, changeable creature. And to refute these views I quote further :

8 “He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things ?”—Rom. viii. 32.

I think he will, and I know he will, and he will certainly give us what we need the most, and as it is natural for the redeemed soul to fear lest he might fall—the very thing of all others he don't want to do—God gives us this promise to reassure and comfort us.

9 “Now unto him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present

you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy."—Jude i. 24.

If he does this for one child, he does it for every child, and therefore no one can so fall as to be lost.

But he does *keep* every child by his own and not by the power in the child.

10 "Who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time."—1 Peter i. 5.

Peter here flatly contradicts Eld. Ditzler, who dares to affirm that our being kept unto salvation, depends, in whole or in part, on ourselves, while Peter says "by the power of God" and that every one kept one moment by it, is kept unto salvation. But to render null and void this precious declaration, Eld. Ditzler says, God only exerts his power to keep us through our faith, which faith may in some fiery trial fail and perish, and any moment therefore the child of God may perish, but Peter teaches otherwise.

11 "The trial of your faith, being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise and honor and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ."—1 Peter i. 7.

But that our salvation rests not upon the continuance of our love, but upon the love of God in Christ to us. Paul affirms—that no created being in the Universe, nor any existing influence can cause God to withdraw or Christ to withhold his love from us.

12 "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? As it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter. Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."—Rom. viii. 35-39.

This love is unchangeable: as it was *from* everlasting so it will be to everlasting ever the same; and while Christ loves us, we shall love him.

Now that each one of us, who have believed on Him through his or the words of his Apostles, should be so united to Him that the union may be as perfect and indissoluble as that which exists between the Father and the Son, he specifically prayed, and him the father heareth always.

13 "I pray not that thou shouldst take them out of the world, but that thou shouldst keep them from the evil. Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also who shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they may also be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou givest me I have given them; that they may be one even as we are one; I in them, and thou in me, that they may

be made perfect in one. Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory which thou hast given me."—*John xvii. 15, 20, 24*

Is not this conclusive that every one the Father hath given his Son, will be kept from the evil of this world finally be with Christ and behold his glory?

This recalls to my mind a stanza of that beautiful hymn that Methodists sing and shout over, but do not believe one word of it.

"But this I do find, we two are so joined
He'll not live in glory and leave me behind,
So this is the race, I'm running thro' *grace*,
Henceforth till admitted to see my Lord's face."

And another, which I commend to the attention of my opponent—

"For thy glory *we are created to share*,
Both the nature and kingdom divine,
Created again, that our souls may remain
In time and eternity thine."

—[Hymn 260, N. C.; Hymn 412, Northern Coll.]

Now while I am really enjoying these delightful sentiments and feel anthems rise and swell my heart, I am grieved by my opponent's declaration that this assurance is a very hurtful and pernicious doctrine. But not so taught his father Wesley. I have met this in *Doctrinal Tracts*, p. 342.

14 "*Question.* May not some of those (who have the testimony, both of their justification and sanctification,) have a testimony from the Spirit that they shall not finally fall from God?"

"*Answer.* They may, and this persuasion, that neither life nor death separate them from Him, far from being hurtful, may, in some circumstances be extremely useful. These, therefore, we should in no wise *grieve*, but earnestly encourage them to hold the beginning of their *confidence* steadfast unto the end."

But I must more rapidly file in my proof texts, so that Eld. Ditzler may have an opportunity to answer them if he thinks he can.

13. "God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able, but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it."—1 Cor. x. 13.

"The soul that on Jesus hath leaned for repose
I will not, I will not desert to its foes.
That soul, though all hell should endeavor to shake,
I'll never, no never, no never forsake."

14. "That by two immutable things in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us, which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil."—Heb. vi. 18, 19.

15. "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit, for the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death."—Rom. viii. 1, 2.

16. "For ye have not received the Spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, 'Abba, Father' (Our Father). The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirits that we are the children of God; and if children then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ."—Rom. viii. 15-17.

17. "That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."—John iii. 15, 16, 36.

18. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall never come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life."—John v. 24.

19. "This is the bread that cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die. I am the living bread that came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread he shall live forever.

"Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day."—John vi. 37-54

20. "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood dwelleth in me, and I in him."

21. "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out."

22. "And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son and believeth on him may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day."

23. "No man can come unto me except the Father who hath sent me draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day."

24. "For whosoever is born of God overcometh the world."—1 John v. 4.

25. "For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified"—i. e., each one for whom it was once offered.

A child of God is one who has come to God by this blood, one who has been cleansed and sanctified by it, and he must, therefore, be saved.

26. "Because I live, ye shall live also."—John xiv. 19.

27. "If a man love me he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him."—John xiv. 23.

Some profess to love, but fall away and go back to the world. Were they Christians?

28. "They went out from us, but they were not of us, for if they had been of us they would have continued with us, but that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us."—1 John ii. 19.

The words "no doubt" were inserted by the translator.

29. "But we are not of those who draw back unto perdition, but of them who believe to the saving of the soul."—Heb. x. 39.

30. "For God is not unrighteous to forget your work and your labor of love which ye have showed toward his name, that ye have ministered to the saints and do minister."—Heb. vi. 10.

31. "Born again of incorruptible seed, which liveth and abideth forever."—1 Peter i. 23.

32. "For which of you, intending to build a tower, sitteth not down first and counteth the cost, whether he have sufficient to finish it? Lest, haply, after he hath laid the foundation, and is not able to finish it, all that behold it begin to mock, saying, This man began to build, and was not able to finish."—Luke xiv. 28

33. "Being confident of this very thing, that he who hath begun a good work in you will perform it (i. e., perfect, continue to perfect it) until the day of Jesus Christ."—Phil. i. 6.

34. "Behold, I lay in Zion, for a foundation, a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation; he that believeth shall not make haste."

35. "Now, therefore, ye are no more strangers (not one of them who is a spiritual member—a living stone—ever will be a stranger again, or alienated), but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner-stone, in whom all the building, fitly framed together, (every member of this spiritual temple is indissolubly framed into Christ), groweth into an holy temple in the Lord, in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit."—Eph. ii. 19, 20.

But I must notice the only *plausible* objection he has advanced, and which was put into the mouths of Methodists from the day that Wesley was decided to preach and print Arminianism rather than election, by the shilling he threw up, coming down "tails rather than heads."*

It is this, if God acts upon the sinner first, giving him spiritual life and causing him to desire above all things to retain it, then man was not left free to choose, and was deprived of moral agency, being acted upon in his conviction and conversion irresistably; and if, after he has been adopted as a child, his will has been so changed and influenced that he cannot love sin, or desire to sin—unless he can still deserve and choose to be lost, and left free to destroy his own soul, then he is left without "moral dignity and grandeur, intellectual force, moral quality or capacity for pleasure"—in a word a "machine"—unaccountable.

The day is coming in General Conferences when *heads* will win in this doctrine.

Now, I have not time to examine these statements, but will say this, if it is true of the child of God, it is true of God and Christ also, for we cannot conceive it possible for either person in the Godhead to be able to sin or even desire to sin, to be lost or to desire to be lost, and still they retain their moral dignity and grandeur and retain the capacity for happiness, and are not mere machines. The child is like the father in this respect, it can no more love sin or desire to sin or to be lost and is unspeakably happy at the thought of its security.

*In a letter from the Rev. Augustus Toplady to Mr Wesley, in 1792, we meet with the following, viz: "Why should you of all people in the world, be so very angry with the doctrines of grace? Forget not the months and days that are past. Remember that it once depended on a toss of a shilling whether you yourself should be a Calvinist or an Arminian. Tails fell uppermost, and you resolved to be an Arminian." Heads will one day fall uppermost. *Arminian Inconsistencies and Errors* by Henry Brown. p. 418.

If the Elder feels particularly bellicose, I want him as usual to take turn at his own Discipline, and Wesley and Watson and when he demolishes them, I will prove to him that *liberty* may exist with impeccability, and moral accountability with God's sovereignty.

I will read to him Art. VIII. of his Discipline :

"The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and works, to faith, and calling upon God; wherefore we have no power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us, when we have that good will."

Now this teaches that the grace of God, must prevent, i. e., go before any act of our own, giving us the *will* to call upon God, and the power to exercise faith, etc. The dead sinner is quickened, made alive without consulting his choice or will, and a *good will* produced within him; and without this "prevenient grace" no man can do a good work, and while it is given he will do the will of God. This is the good work begun by God, and if so, will be carried on unto the day of the Lord Jesus. Art. X. is also sound, since it states that the faith and good works, are the fruits of justification, follow after it, and do not produce it and consequently do not preserve and continue it. Here then is Eld. Ditzler's irresistible grace that destroys man's accountability in his own Discipline. What will he do with it? Repudiate the Discipline as he has done in other propositions?

Now what did Mr. Wesley believe—"It may be allowed God acts as sovereign in convincing some souls of sin, *arresting them in their mad career by RESISTLESS POWER*. It seems, also, that at the moment of our conversion, he *acts IRRESISTIBLY*." I only differ from Wesley in believing that God so acts in *every* case. Again, "I do not deny that in some souls the *grace of God is so far irresistible that THEY CANNOT BUT BELIEVE AND BE FINALLY SAVED*."

Will Eld. Ditzler assail his father Wesley? What will he say about this?

But more. In his comments on Rom. viii., Wesley asks, "What is it then we learn from the whole account? It is this, and nothing more: 1. God knows all believers. 2. Wills that they should be saved from sin. 3. To this end justifies them. 4. Sanctifies them; and, 5. Takes them to glory."

What is this but affirming the salvation of every child of God?

Again. (The question is, if one once justified is not saved.) "To him that is justified, or forgiven, God WILL NOT IMPUTE SIN TO HIS CONDEMNATION. He will not condemn him on that

account, either in this world or in that which is to come. * * And from the time we are accepted through the beloved, reconciled to God through his blood, he loves and blesses, and watches over us for good as if we had never sinned."—*Sermon on Justification.*

Again: "With regard to final preservation, I am inclined to believe there is a state attainable in this life from which a man CANNOT finally fall; and that he has attained it who can say, 'Old things are passed away; all things are become new.'" Works, Vol. III. 289.

Now, every child of God can say this truly, therefore every child of God has attained a state from which he CANNOT FALL.

In the Doctrinal Tracts, page 163, the General Conference says, "That assurance of faith which these enjoy, (who have the witness of the Spirit,) excludes all doubt and fear concerning their future perseverance; though it is not properly an assurance of what is future, but only what now is." "It excludes all kind of doubt and fear concerning their final perseverance!"

How remarkably this accords with the Scriptures: "I will make an everlasting covenant with them, that I will not turn away from them to do them good, but I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me." Jer, xxii. 24.

But a little from R. Watson on Eld. Ditzler's assertion that unless a being was free to sin and could sin to his own destruction he is not a moral being but a machine.

"Let us hear Mr. Watson. "Imperfection must in comparison of God and the creature's own capacity of improvement, remain the character of a finite being; but it is not so clear that this imperfection must at all times, and through the whole course of existence, imply liability to sin. God is free, and yet he cannot be tempted of evil. "It is impossible for him to lie, not for want of natural freedom, but because of an absolute moral perfection. Liberty and impeccability imply therefore no contradiction."

"Let us hear the Apostle Paul. "For if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life."—Rom. v. 10.

Now if there is no interference with moral liberty in reconciling enemies to God, does it follow that the grace which keeps them in a state of reconciliation, is so much greater than that which reconciled them, that "a man after conversion is no longer a free agent?"

So thought not Paul. The Arminian, therefore, must give up his Wesley, his Watson, the Apostle Paul, etc., or give up his objection. His great error is, in supposing that one who loves God supremely, (as every Christian must,) may desire to fall from that state of love; and that unless he is permitted to do so, he will be deprived of his liberty. Whereas, such an alienation of heart implies the absence of all love. Although then, such a man may, in the exercise of free agency, fall into sin, he cannot fall from grace."

This says Dr. Brown is perhaps the most artful objection ever brought against the doctrine, as it leads directly to an inquiry concerning the mode of the divine operation on the human heart—a subject on which, while in this world we must remain profoundly ignorant. But where reason fails, revelation shines with peculiar brightness. "Now unto him

that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy, to the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty and dominion and power." Jude 24.

"Here it is expressly declared, that the Lord "is able to keep his people from falling, and to present them faultless before the presence of his glory." To those therefore who urge the above objection, we reply. "ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, neither the power of God."—Arminian, pp. 334-335.

The Good Shepherd declares that not only does he hold each sheep in his Own Almighty hands, but that the Father who gave him the sheep to keep is so interested in both the honor of the Shepherd and the safety of the sheep that he throws his Own Almighty hands over those of the Shepherd so that the power of both, the Father and Son, would have to be overcome before the weakest sheep could be lost.

36. "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me."—John x. 27.

37. "And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand."—John x. 28.

38. "My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand."—John x. 29.

There is another passage, similar to this—

39. "For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God."—Col. iii. 3.

"Ye"—the Christians at Collossee, so every Christian everywhere—"are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God."

We have instanced a miner, who, discovering an immense diamond, first hid it in a small safe, closely locked, and then hid the small safe in a large burglar-proof safe, so that the thief would be compelled to destroy both safes before he could reach the gem,—so in this case; the Christian, first being hid in Christ, and then with Christ in God, both God and Christ would have to be destroyed to get one Christian: and if one, then Satan could take all, there being nothing left to hinder him; and so the poet correctly sings:—

"Not as the world the Savior gives;
He's an unchanging friend;
Whom once he loves, he never leaves,
But loves him to the end.

Else Satan might full victory boast;
The Church might wholly fall;
*If one believer may be lost,
Then, surely, so may all."*

But the safety of each one that *ever was, for one moment*, hid with Christ in God, is assured in the next verse:—

41. "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory." (Col. iii. 4.) Yes: we *shall appear*, every one that ever was known by Christ as a

“sheep,” or a “saint,” or a “child” for one moment, from Abel down, when he appears the second time in his glory, with ten thousands of angels, who will appear with him; for it is expressly said, that at his second coming he will bring all his saints with him (Zec. xiv. 5, 1 Thes. iii. 13); and then will it be manifested to the universe, that of all the Father gave him, he had lost not one.

Now, I wish you all to notice how Eld. Ditzler meets these forty-one passages, that assert the faithfulness of Christ in his office as the shepherd, and then you may decide whether his first speech made useless my prepared argument, which includes also his office as Kinsman, Redeemer; as Surety to the Father for the salvation of each one that ever believed; and as the Atoning Priest of the everlasting covenant.

If I thought my Methodist friends felt like singing, I would propose to close by singing one of their own songs, but as they do not, I will read it:—

“ We clap our hands exulting,
In thine Almighty favour;
The love divine that made us thine,
Can keep us thine for ever.

“Thou dost conduct thy people,
Through torrents of temptation;
Nor will we fear, when thou art near,
The fire of tribulation.

“The world with sin and Satan,
In vain our march opposes;
By thee we shall break through them all,
And sing the song of Moses.”—*Hymn 275.*

DR. DITZLER'S THIRD SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—As a mariner rejoices at the sight of land when for days he has been on the deep, so my good friend and I now rejoice at sight of land, of rest to our weary frames and lungs, and I shall glide into port a little ahead.

The Doctor is right in the application of Dr. Summer's words, that a thousand hypotheses do not affect a *clearly declared doctrine*. And have I been trying so long and hard to convince Dr. Graves of it, and never succeeded till this good hour? Hence the pains with which we labored to show him. 1, That in the very nature of things he cannot establish the negative, or refute the affirmative of this proposition. There is no way of doing it. Even if we never found where one did perish who was regenerated, it is no proof no such case occurred. If no such case occurs in past history, it is no absolute proof it may not occur, though we admit its moral force would be great. But neither of these can be done. Not only so, but the processes of reasoning of the Doctor are based on assumptions utterly antagonistic to all the Bible, subverting the foundations of all our accountability to God.

"But the point is, will a child of God do it?" that is fall, etc. No, no, "is it possible?" is the point. That is the question.

Paul tells us certain parties "are fallen from grace," Gal. v. 4. Christ tells us we cannot bear fruit except we abide in him," John xv.

The Doctor tells us, commenting on Paul's strong language, if we lose it,—this religion, then "we cannot be renewed," are lost. That exactly establishes my proposition then.

He quotes Paul as if when a man was converted, the whole salvation was "perfected," whereas Paul urges that a system giving "completeness" as the word means, to Christian character, and perfectly adapted to our condition is now completed. It has no bearing whatever on our Proposition. Wesley's inclination to believe there was a state of grace so exalted as that we, in its enjoyment, may be said to be made perfect, affects not our Proposition in the least.

He urges that a husband married cannot be divorced. So we are married to Christ. But, 1st. In the Bible divorces are

named as early as the Prophets Isaiah and Amos, as well as in Moses. 2. In the New Testament divorces are named as well-known matters. 3. We know they exist now—are as plentiful as blackberries in some States—cheap.

But we are *sealed*. But seals may be broken. Figures are not to “go on all fours.” All these expressions are used to convey a specific, proper idea. But never was it designed that great doctrinal ideas should be founded on the mere accidents of metaphorical language. It would destroy all biblical exegesis at once. If you wish to establish a doctrine, you must find where it is pointedly set forth—where the mind of the writer was clearly on that subject, hence meant it in that way. That at least is altogether necessary as a starting point in all the doctrines of religion. It is wholly unallowable to catch up the merest possible deduction, or accidental force of an illustration in Scripture, where the context clearly shows that the deduction or application you make of it was not at all in his mind—not under discussion. The word “sealed” does not imply that a man cannot lose God’s spiritual influence upon him; for that is what he calls sealing him. He expressly tells us those who have received the Spirit—which is the sealing, “have fallen away,” and it is impossible to renew them unto repentance even. Heb. vi. 2–4.

Those who went out from us because not of us, have nothing to do with those who went out, became “entangled,” “overcome,” “shipwrecked.” They are the ones we are talking about. In one passage it is said—“If any man say I love God and keep not his commandments, he is a liar,” etc. It has been proposed to render this: If any man say I have loved God, and keep not his commandments, he is a liar,” etc.

1. It is a false rendering. It is perfect tense in Greek, always without any exception, embracing the present, though running into the past. Thus if I was married and my wife had been dead only ten minutes, I cannot use the perfect tense. The relation must continue. I have been, I continue, I am married, is the force of the Greek perfect. Hence *egnoka* is present. I have known still continue to know, I do know God, and keep not, etc. That is its force.

2. It would be strange if John were to say no one who had known God had ever violated His commandments, especially in the face of Paul’s and Peter’s teachings and all men’s experience.

The Doctor holds that Peter was an Arminian, but in his trial he lost it all, and became a good Calvinist. Now it was just the reverse. He was a *fine* Calvinist—avowed though

everybody grew weak-kneed and fled, *he* would stand. He had seen Christ do such wonderful things, he thought he was in that safe. But when Satan made a pass or two at him, it took all of those notions out of his head, and late in life he wrote that strong testimony we quoted from the second chapter of his second epistle.

And he had been such a Calvinist that he would not go to Gentiles, but was perfectly satisfied God was a respecter of persons. But when God let down the sheet in a vision, Peter learned at last that God was no respecter of persons. Acts x.

He drew a strong picture of Job's sufferings when attacked so fiercely by Satan. Yet he tells us he could not be overcome. But he failed to tell us why Job did not fall. "In all this Job sinned not." There was his security. He remained faithful. It shows us the force of that truth—He will give us grace. We must use it. But while Job sinned not, did not Adam sin? Did not David, Saul, Solomon, Peter sin? Job did not, but they did.

We must now review some of the texts and points we made in our two speeches, and submit the question to you. We started by saying of this proposition,

1. It is largely redundant in debate, since practically all preach and profess to act as if we could fall and be lost.

2. It should, therefore, be a non-essential, and left to liberty of conscience.

3. We are safe on it, for 1. If you should be found to have proofs enough to establish your side, we are safe, and have to be admitted as following Apostolic precedents in warning against the evil, and of the danger of it.

2. If we are right, you are in a fearfully dangerous position.

3. It is impossible for him to refute the proposition, even if he could prove that no one had ever fallen.

4. Was there ever a document, code, or law, put forth by responsible men, moralists, legislators, warning against imminent dangers, full of warnings where no danger existed?

With these general remarks we proceed to sustain our affirmative.

I. BY THE HISTORY OF FACTS.

1. The angels (2 Pet. ii, 4; Jude 6) fell and were lost.

2. Adam and Eve fell.

3. David fell, but recovered. Solomon fell, and we are left in uncertainty as to his fate. Peter fell and recovered. Judas fell and "went to his own place." He communed, and was therefore a "baptized believer," if Dr. Graves' theory be correct—a slender thing to hold to, by the way. All these are

cases where the parties did fall into fearful crimes—sins. Others could be added—Hymenius and Alexander whom Paul names expressly, and Saul, the King.

Now of such men as David, Peter, etc., suppose they had died while in this condition, what becomes of them. They would perish, you say. The only question then is—can a regenerate man die when he is guilty of such a fall as David? Look at it calmly. A man is regenerated—pardoned. Now you are bound to admit that he can, and many do, commit alarming, yea, damning sins after being regenerated. If they can commit one, they can commit two—five—ten—scores of sins. Now he becomes fearfully guilty. In that fix, he is better qualified to sin than ever. Can he die in that fix? If not, he can just sin on, and live on. You see this doctrine will not do, and its absurdity is manifest, from this stand-point.

Before we review some of our proof texts, let us look again at the objections Dr. Graves and others rely on to offset these facts.

It is urged that the possibility of final apostasy implies imperfection in Deity, failure to accomplish what is undertaken. But we answer,

1. He has not undertaken to save men unconditionally, but on their “overcoming,” “being faithful until death,” “enduring unto the end,” “so running as to obtain.”

2. It proves too much, if that much.

(1). The angels were made to be happy, yet some fell, and defeated the end of their creation.

(2). Adam, made to be happy, fell.

(3). Conversion, grace, etc., exist that we sin not, but love and serve God, etc., yet Peter, David, fell, and many godly people fell into sin. God engaged and covenanted to provide against these evils, works ways for escape, but never engaged beyond aid, grace, help, succor, ways to escape for us, we to use them as sinners are to use their opportunities, etc.

(4). God is opposed to all sin, yet sin exists.

(5). He desires, and provides for, the salvation of all men, yet men are lost. It is not for the glory of God or the interests of earth that men be unconditionally regenerated or saved.

II. A change in Deity. This is weak indeed.

Is it a greater or more of the nature of a change for God to hate in Bible style, the wicked, and love the same person when a child, born of God, etc., than loving him as a child, he rebels, Satan enters, “led captive at his will,” and he blasphemes, and “is delivered over to Satan,” and Deity now hates him—i. e., his ways.

We see that this is the old story over again, of simply relying on special pleading, with no foundation, no theological principle to rest on. We are free to state that had he, 1. taken the genuine, old-fashioned Calvinistic ground, 2. could he have proved it to be true in its restrictive points—making man wholly passive, destroying all freedom, so that man can only act under a propelling force, and be wholly passive in all matters, he would have a solid foundation; and the contest would be wholly on whether that were so or not. But he is far removed from that stand-point of theology. We appeal to, rely on the plain Bible, and his position fails as tried by this test. Now take the texts before quoted—Ezk. xviii. 22, 24; and the following:

“And I will make the rivers dry, and sell the land into the hand of the wicked; and I will make the land waste, and all that is therein, by the hand of strangers: I the LORD have spoken *it*. Thus saith the Lord God; I will also destroy the idols, and I will cause *their* images to cease out of Noph; and there shall be no more a prince of the land of Egypt: and I will put a fear in the land of Egypt. At Tehaphneches also the day shall be darkened, when I shall break there the yokes of Egypt: and the pomp of her strength shall cease in her: as for her, a cloud shall cover her, and her daughters shall go into captivity.” Ezek. xxx. 12, 13-18.

This shows that the righteousness spoken of is that which God required that they might live, as opposed to “wickedness,” “iniquity.” Again—

“For *it is* impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, And have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, ‘*And have fallen*’ (*kai parepesontas*) ‘away’—the Aorist tense—‘to renew them,’ etc. For the earth which drinketh in the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom it is dressed, receiveth blessing from God: But that which beareth thorns and briers *is* rejected, and *is* nigh unto cursing; whose end *is* to be burned.” Heb. vi 4-8.

Now notice here, they were once enlightened, have tasted of the heavenly gift, were made partakers of the Holy Spirit, had tasted the good word of God, yea, and of the powers of the world to come—what exalted enjoyments and maturity of grace, “and have fallen away to renew them unto repentance”—the starting point of reformation. The reasons he gives, verse 6. He explains it in verses 7 and 8—that is the earth that receives so many bounties, rain, sunshine is nigh unto cursing, rejected, so will be such persons as receive such boundless blessings from God as Paul describes, yet continue not therein.

There is no “if” in the Greek. Nor does the term in the connection tolerate it; and no scholar has ever dared justify Beza for putting in “si” if, in the text in Latin.

We could requote a host of texts, but they are all in our first speech, and it is needless to repeat them.—[*Time out.*

DR. GRAVES' THIRD CLOSING REPLY.

MR. PRESIDENT:—From the brief sample I gave you of my MSS. which I have laid by, you can judge, and the readers of the debate will judge whether my opponent's speech just delivered made them useless and null. The one fact developed, that Christ in the Covenant of Redemption became surety to the Father—for all given him by the Father—for every one who should at any time believe on him and be known and received by him as a sheep, forever settles this question—and that feature Eld. Ditzler will never successfully assail. To boast is the peculiar weakness of the Elder, and he must be indulged in it.

But I will express my gratification at the readiness with which Elder Ditzler accepted my proposition to meet at a convenient future day, in the city of Nashville, and discuss for days this one proposition with a view to publication. I will notify him within eighteen or twenty-four months from this day, so that the publication may not interfere with this. Therefore, let no one regard this as a *discussion* but a *discursion* affording little more than a glance at the ground to be examined, and the Scriptures that seem to sustain the affirmative. Time of course, will not permit me to notice but a few of the many passages he may claim as favoring him, and I would prefer that he would indicate five or six of these he regards as the strongest, and I will devote my time to them. Will you do so? He declines. I will then glance at as many as I can that he seems to emphasize.

1. The holy angels fell, and are hopelessly lost.

I reply the case is not parallel and does not apply: the angels did not stand in the Covenant of Redemption. They were under law, and not grace, and they stood in their own strength, had no *surety*. The Apostle refers to their case not to warn Christians against Apostacy, but as proof that God will punish the false teachers of his day, and it should be a warning to all false teachers to-day who are teaching for doctrines, human traditions and the commandments of men.

2. Adam and Eve lived under a Covenant of works, and not that of Redemption or Grace and in their *own strength* without a surety.

This case is alluded to by the Apostle to teachers of the

subtlety of the Devil in alluring to sin, that we may be warned of his devices. A child of God may be tempted to sin, to his own sorrow, as the children of our love are often influenced to do those things that offend us, but they are nevertheless our children, and love us devotedly and supremely. Neither of these two examples have any bearing upon this question.

3. In my opponent's first speech, he said he would omit the examples of Saul and Solomon, but in his next he especially passes them in proof, and I may as well glance at them. There is no evidence that Saul was ever a Christian, but the contrary, and is in his relations to David used as a type of Satan, the opposer, the persecuter and attempted murderer of God's anointed. We are not warranted to infer that because it is recorded of him at one time that God gave him another heart, and the Spirit of the Lord came upon him, so that he prophesied that therefore he was regenerated and became a child of God, and when afterwards it is said the spirit of the Lord departed from him, that he then fell from grace.

So far from it his life from the day he was crowned King of Israel to the day the Spirit of the Lord left him is proof that he was a Godless man. He was King for more than two years before "he built an altar unto the Lord." Comp. 1, Saml. xiii, with i. Saml. xiv, 35.

Nearly every recorded religious act of his life savors far more of rash impiety than of piety. The spirit of the Lord came upon Balaam and he prophesied truly of Christ and of Israel, yet he was a Godless man, and desired to curse God's people, to obtain the gold and honors of Balak. And Caiaphas the high priest was inspired to prophesy truly concerning Christ and yet he was a wicked man. There is no satisfactory evidence that Saul was ever a regenerate man, and his case is inapplicable.

4. That Solomon was truly pure in the early part of his life is admitted by all, and he was a distinguished type of Christ as was David his father, but that he fell into greivous sin, is also admitted—but that he died impenitent and was finally lost is claimed by Eld. Ditzler and Arminians, though they fail to prove that he died impenitent. That God had a purpose in permitting Solomon to seek and to search out all things that are done under heaven, "to prove mirth, and to enjoy pleasure," and to "take hold on folly," that he might, for the good of all who should follow him, declare that they were all vanity and vexation of spirit, as God allowed Job to be afflicted and to sin by speaking rashly and impiously for the sake of those who should read his history. That the book of Ecclesiastes

is one of confession and evidence of repentance, is freely conceded by commentators generally; so Solomon's case, proves nothing in favor of final Apostacy. At the close of his life he wrote three books of the Bible which is full proof that he was a holy man, 2 Pet. 1-4.

5. The declaration of Ezek. xviii. 24 and 33; xii. 13, instanced by Eld. Ditzler, does not prove the possibility of the Apostacy and final ruin of an adopted child of God, though so persistently urged by the advocates of Apostacy. There are two things taken for granted by them all from Mr. Wesley, down to the disputant of this day, viz. 1. That the person denominated "*righteous*" in these passages, denotes a truly regenerate character. 2. That the death here spoken of is the second death. That neither supposition is true, is evident from the fact that if so, no man who ever lived on earth ever was saved. Noah, nor Abraham, nor Job, nor Moses, nor David, for each and all did sin, and if in their sin they died eternally they, and all the patriarchs and prophets and apostles are in hell to-day. Why, sir, according to Eld. Ditzler's construction, no Christian, should he sin, could find any place for repentance, he must die in his sins, and be lost! Wesley and no Methodist then was ever saved.

That the term "*righteous*" is used with respect to innocence of the violation of the civil law, I refer all to Deut. xxv. 1; 1 Kings viii. 31, 32; 1 Kings ii. 32, and x. 9. These characters were called "*righteous*," but they were not therefore regenerate persons. The death referred to is not eternal death, but temporal, and the offence is evidently the violation of the civil law, as enacted by Moses. Deut. xvi. 19.

"Thou shalt not wrest judgment; thou shalt not respect persons, neither take a gift; for a gift doth blind the eyes of the wise, and pervert the words of the righteous."

Deut. xxiv. 16.

"The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers; every man shall be put to death for his own sin."

Respecting the operation of this law Amaziah furnished a practical illustration, thus—

"And it came to pass, as soon as the kingdom was confirmed in his hand, that he slew his servants which had slain the king his father. But the children of the murderers he slew not: according unto that which is written in the book of the law of Moses, wherein the Lord commanded, saying, The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, nor the children be put to death for the fathers; but every man shall be put to death for his own sin."—2 Kings xiv 5, 6.

With the proper definition of the terms and the law of Moses before us we are prepared to redeem this passage from the perversions of Arminians.

"The Jews, like other nations punished some sins with death, and their civil officers were required to inflict that penalty on the offender, irrespective of his standing in society. Accordingly we have the instructions to that effect given in Deuteronomy, repeated in Ezekiel: 'The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son. The righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him.' 'When the righteous turneth from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and doeth according to all the abominations that the wicked man doeth, shall he live? All his righteousness that he hath done, shall not be mentioned;' (as a bar between him and justice, 'in his trespass that he hath trespassed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, in them shall he die.'—Ezek. xviii 20, 24.

Here my opponent leaves the Old Testament. It does not afford him a passage nor an example to support his theory—he has of course brought forth all the strongest. Now I will read you a few unequivocal positive passages from one chapter in the Old Testament before I leave it, to let you see what it does teach on this subject.

"For the arms of the wicked shall be broken: but the Lord upholdeth the righteous. The Lord knoweth the days of the upright: and their inheritance shall be forever. The steps of a good man are ordered by the Lord: and he delighteth in his way. Though he fall, he shall not be utterly cast down: for the Lord upholdeth him with his hand. For the Lord loveth judgment, and forsaketh not his saints; they are preserved for ever; but the seed of the wicked shall be cut off. The law of his God is in his heart; none of his steps shall slide. The wicked watcheth the righteous, and seeketh to slay him. The Lord will not leave him in his hand, nor condemn him when he is judged. Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright: for the end of that man is peace."

The child of God is constantly held by the right hand of the Almighty, who has promised never to forsake him, and though he fall seven times he will rise again. But if Eld. Ditzler's doctrine be true, no saint ever was or ever will be saved, because if these falls mean the loss of the grace of regeneration, there is no recovery from them, for this is the Word of God touching each fall from a state of grace and regeneration. It is impossible to renew them to repentance." "There remaineth no more sacrifice for sin." *There never was, there never will be a case of apostasy from grace, where the soul was ever, or ever will be recovered.*

6. The first examples and passages he quotes from the New Testament are 1 Tim. i, 18-20, and 2 Tim. 16, 17—Hymeneus, Alexander and Philetus. He claims, without proving, 1. That these were once truly regenerated persons. 2. That the faith of which they had made shipwreck, was the saving faith, "begun by grace;" and 3. That their being delivered unto Satan, was consigning their souls to endless perdition. Before these passages and examples help him in the least, he must prove these three things, which he cannot do.

First, if they were indeed regenerated and God had thus

begun a good work in their hearts, He certainly left them not to perish.

"Being confident of this very thing, that he which hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ."—Phil. i, 6.

And then you sing from your hymn book—

"Thy saints in all this glorious war
Shall conquer tho' they die."

And this :

"His glory *shall* bring up the rear,
And perfect what his grace begun."

If they were once Christians and finally lost, both the Word of God and your Hymn Book teach falsely.

But, 2. They may have been Christians and fallen into erroneous doctrine, for which Paul excluded them, and exclusion and possibly the infliction of bodily ills, have been all Paul meant by delivering them to Satan. (See 1 Cor. v, 5) and yet this incestuous man was subsequently restored to the fellowship of the church. See 2 Cor. ii, 6.

3. These men might have been false professors, who, as such are in our day wont to, assumed leadership in the church, whom Paul had put away. Upon which supposition the declaration of 1 John, ii, 19, covers their cases and all other *apparent apostates*, for they being false teachers, were of Anti-Christ.

"They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us."—1 John, ii, 19.

And this language of Peter sufficiently explains the many apparent apostasies to be only a falling for the want of grace, falling from a mere profession of grace enjoyed.

"But it is happened unto them according to the true proverb, The dog is turned to his own vomit again; and, the sow that was washed, to her wallowing in the mire."—2 Peter, ii, 22.

If one of those apostate characters should claim that they were *once* in a state of regeneration, though now a child of Satan, John meets them with this assertion—"He that says—*egnoka auton*—I have known him and keepeth not—[*veroon*, is not keeping]—his commandments, is a liar and the truth is not in him." The idea is that a Christian may be temporarily overcome of temptation, of which he will repent with godly sorrow so soon as he discovers his error, but to live and take pleasure in known sin for weeks and months is an impossible supposition. Paul settles this question beyond cavil by asking a question that men nor angels can answer—"How shall we, who are dead *to* sin, live any longer therein?"—Rom. vi, 2. We can as well suppose the dead to rise from their graves and

enjoy the pleasures of this world as was their wont, as to suppose that a true Christian can take pleasure in known sin.

7 Elder Ditzler brings forward the two "sugar sticks" of all Arminians. Heb. vi, 3, 6, 8; and Heb. xi, 26-29—the last but a repetition of the first. Now in neither of these passages is it said that any Christian had actually fallen, or that they would, but there is a statement made of what would follow, result, supposing a child of God should really "*fall from*" the grace of adoption and return back to a state of unregeneracy—a result, mark you, *Eld. Ditzler nor his Society, nor any Arminian, will accept, i. e., that such an one is irretrievably lost; can never be renewed to repentance, or saved.* Now I insist that Eld. Ditzler shall accept all the teachings of this passage, that if a Christian *should fall*, it don't say that one may or ever did fall, he can never be recovered. It plainly says this, but Eld. Ditzler flatly contradicts it, and teaches that Christians have fallen, and may fall, and yet be renewed to repentance and saved! But if it is true that a soul, recovered in the image of Jesus, can so fall as to lose that image, then it is true that that image can never be renewed or that soul ever saved. And this doctrine is the bane of Arminianism.

But these passages, as they stand in our version or the accepted Greek text, do not prove that it is either *possible* or *probable* that an adopted child of God can so apostatize as to be forever lost.

I am tempted to quote his Syriac upon him, a version he places on an equality with the Greek text, if not far above it. Thus it stands:

"For it is impossible that they who have been baptized, and who have tasted the gift which is from heaven and have received the Spirit of Holiness, and have tasted the good word of God and the power of the coming age, should sin so that they should be renewed again to repentance and again crucify the Son of God and put him to ignominy." This rendering is approved by Barnes, who refers to it to show that the Syrian Christians were orthodox on the question of the Saints' Preservation. But take our version; though there is no "if" expressed, the supposition is clearly expressed in the participle: "Having fallen away," and it is nothing but a suppository case. And will an intelligent Christian claim that a supposition really teaches the possibility of the thing supposed?

Let us try a few cases:

John viii, 55—Christ, speaking of his Father says, "If I should say I know him not." Does this mean that it *was*

possible or probable that Christ might say this and become a *liar*?

John xxi, 22—"If I will that he [John] tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" The Apostles fell into this error until corrected—that it might be not only possible but very probable that John would never die. But Christ did not say it or intimate it any more than Paul intimated in these passages that a child of God would trample the blood wherewith he was sanctified under his feet as an unholy thing. Such an act is from its very nature morally impossible.

Gal. i, 8—"But though, [i. e. if,] we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed."

Here the Apostle clearly supposes an impossible case, in order to assert in the strongest manner possible that the doctrine he had preached was true. And so by the passages under review, Paul was teaching by the epistle the infinite superiority of the priesthood and sacrifice and blood of Christ over the Jewish sacrifices. They could and needed to be offered repeatedly and then did not put away sin or make the comer unto God perfect, but the blood of Christ, once offered, *for ever perfected* them that are sanctified by it, and therefore it needed not to be offered again, and owing to its perfect and completed work, there was no provision made for a second offering, and hence the conclusion to which the Apostles lead their minds, if the efficacy of the blood and sacrifice could be lost, there could be no fresh application of it and the subject would, in that case, inevitably be lost. But lest the Jewish Christians to whom he wrote might conclude that it was possible to lose the efficacy of this sacrifice, and so fall from grace, the Apostle says:

"But, beloved, we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation, though we thus speak. For God is not unrighteous to forget your work and labor of love, which ye have shewed toward his name, in that ye have ministered to the saints, and do minister."—Heb. vi. 9, 10.

8. His eighth amounts to nothing in the semblance of proof to sustain the Elder's position, for it means nothing more than the conversion of a sinner who bears the name of brother, for if he was living in sin and his soul was in a state of death, he was an unregenerate man, for all true Christians are said to have "passed from death unto life, and can never more come into condemnation"—John v. 24—or be again exposed to the penalty of violated law, because they have been "freed from sin," and the dominion of the law, and adopted as the sons and daughters of the Most High.

"And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ."
—Rom. viii. 17.

9. But Eld. Ditzler claims that Judas was an adopted child of God, and thus convicts Christ of slandering him. It was in the early part of his ministry that Christ indicated the true character of Judas. "Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?" John vi. 70. And John well knew his character.

"This he said, not that he cared for the poor; but because he was a thief, and had the bag, and bare what was put therein."—John xii. 6.

I find it nowhere indicated that Judas' name was written in heaven—that was said of the seventy disciples, among whom was no Judas. Eld. Ditzler again claims that Judas was permitted by Christ to partake of the Lord's Supper and quotes John xiii. 27. It is by this passage in John in which we are circumstantially told at what supper Judas was; and when he left that we must interpret the indefinite passages of the other evangelists who do not state the occurrences in chronological order. 'John says it was the Passover Supper and not the Lord's Supper that followed which Judas ate with Christ. "The Supper" was only eaten in connection with the Passover Supper, and it was when Christ gave the sop to Judas, that he went out *immediately* to consummate his plans for betraying Jesus, and it was after Judas left that Christ instituted the Lord's Supper. So John positively declares that *Judas was not at the last Supper*.

10. But "David fell and recovered," says Eld. Ditzler. It is not true that David apostatized from God's grace, was for one moment a child of wrath after he had for the first time experienced the blessedness of those whose sins are covered. David sinned, repented bitterly, and was forgiven as a father forgives a child; he lost the *joy*, but never his *hope* of salvation.

11. It is true Peter, after his own bitter experience, warns his brethren against falling, not from God's favor and the *grace* of salvation, but into sin as he did. And this the true children of God are liable to do as our children are liable to disobey and offend us; and this is all that is taught in 2 Peter i. 9, 10.

12. Peter, in his Second Epistle ch. ii. verses 18-25, speaks of certain characters who seemed to have professed a change of life and knowledge of Christ, and had in a measure reformed themselves from many of their sins and cleansed themselves of their pollutions, yet soon turning back to them so that the old proverb was applicable in their case:

"The dog is turned to his own vomit again, and the sow

that was washed to her wallowing in the mire." The *nature* of neither had never been changed, and there are thousands to-day in the church and alas! how many in the pulpit whose carnal natures have never been changed, though they profess and really seem to have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of Jesus Christ. But their sins will find them out, and they become entangled therein and go back to their own vomit, and to wallowing in the mire—but this cannot be said of Christians, for "they are not of those who draw back unto perdition but those who believe to the saving of their souls."—Heb. x. 39.

13. The warnings are addressed to the whole brotherhood of the church, lest any might receive the grace, the offered grace in vain; and the strong and intelligent brother who can understand that an idol is nothing, is warned against pursuing such a course, the natural *tendency* of which would be to lead a weak brother into the sin of idolatry and ruin. The tendency and the result of the unchecked tendency is one matter: and to assume that with the instructions and warnings given, a true child of God will pursue the tendency to his final ruin, is quite another. The faithful warnings may be the means chosen of God to be the effectual guards against the dangers.

14. *Paul, an inspired apostle, feared lest he might be a "castaway."* 1 Cor. ix. 27.

Paul never feared any such thing, for we have heard him say, "There is *now* no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus,"—no possibility of such an one ever coming into condemnation; and he concludes that chapter (Rom. viii.) beginning with that declaration, with these words:—

"Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? *shall* tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword?" "Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

And again he says: "For I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day." Paul, then, was not afraid of being *lost*, but his anxiety was to give to others clear *proof* of his regeneration, by keeping his body under, and bringing all his powers, his will and propensities in subjection to the law of Christ, lest that, failing to do which, after preaching to others he himself would be *adokimos*, without proof that he was what he professed to be. *Proofless* is all the term *adokimos* means. The new life, good works and holy

living are all the proofs that Christians can furnish to others of the reality of their professions.

15. He appeals to Rev. xxii. 19 to prove that an adopted child of God may apostatize, and finally perish; but what proof does it afford? It does not intimate that a child of God would do such a thing, or would desire to do it, or could be tempted to do it. It is not supposable that a true child could be so actuated by the very spirit of anti-christ as to desire to add to or take from God's word, but it is supposable that such an act could be presumed upon by those who think they are, and who profess to be Christians. Then, what is the force of the expression, "take away his part from the tree of life" (for Eld. Ditzler should have known that "book of life" is not in the Greek text; but he, I suppose, does not read his Testament in Greek) when the person evidently never had any real, actual right to the tree of life, or part in the holy city, or the rich spiritual blessings described in this book? This is evidently and certainly a Hebraistic form used by Christ, and means here precisely what Christ meant in Matt. xiii. 12:—

"For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance; but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath."

This passage seems paradoxical; but let Christ explain it:—

"Take heed therefore how ye hear: for whosoever hath, to him shall be given; and whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he seemeth to have."—Luke viii. 18.

It is tantamount to saying, that he shall have no part in the things mentioned in this book, nor ever be blessed of God, but cursed; and it is a warning that should cause false teachers to "exceedingly fear and quake." I defer all further discussion of this important question to the discussion agreed upon.

You must all have noticed that Eld. Ditzler has not produced one plain passage that teaches that a child of God ever perished, but he has relied solely upon inferences and suppositions to establish his doctrine, while I have produced only plain, unequivocal passages of Scripture; and I here assure you, that neither the laws nor the doctrines of Christianity are left to be built upon such a precarious foundation. You will be safe and blessed if you will reject, this day, from your faith and practice every doctrine and every thing you now practice for an ordinance or rite of religious duty which you cannot find plainly taught in God's word.

In view of the subject, as far as we have discussed it, of Arminians, Baptists can say, "Their Rock is not as our

Rock, our enemies themselves being judges." And well we may sing, with the spirit and understanding —

How firm a foundation, ye saints of the Lord,
Is laid for your faith in his excellent word!
What more can he say than to you he hath said—
You, who unto Jesus for refuge have fled?

In every condition—in sickness, in health,
In poverty's vale, or abounding in wealth,
At home and abroad, on the land, on the sea,
As thy days may demand, shall thy strength ever be.

Fear not; I am with thee; O, be not dismayed;
I, I am thy God, and will still give thee aid;
I'll strengthen thee, help thee, and cause thee to stand,
Upheld by my righteous, omnipotent hand.

When through the deep waters I call thee to go,
The rivers of woe shall not thee overflow;
For I will be with thee, thy troubles to bless,
And sanctify to thee thy deepest distress.

When through fiery trials thy pathway shall lie,
My grace, all-sufficient, shall be thy supply;
The flame shall not hurt thee: I only design
Thy dross to consume, and thy gold to refine.

Even down to old age, all my people shall prove
My sovereign, eternal, unchangeable love;
And when hoary hairs shall their temples adorn,
Like lambs they shall still in my bosom be borne.

The soul that on Jesus hath leaned for repose,
I will not, I will not, desert to his foes;
That soul, though all hell should endeavor to shake,
I'll never, no, never, no, never, forsake.

THE END.

- Address, on opening debate by
Col. John B. Hale, President.. 9
- Agamemnon—His immersion... 258
- His survival discredits Dr.
Ditzler's *dictum* identifying
immersion with drowning..... 258
- Alford Dean—Changeable and
may change again yet..... 240
- "*Amad*"—Its import in Syriac.. 386
and again, on p 465
- To *immerse* only a derivative
meaning of..... 467
- Eminent Lexicographers cited
who define it—"to *immerse*,
to *dip*,"..... 387
- Dr. Gotch on..... 388
- How used in early Christian
writings..... 390
- That it means to immerse is
proved by the present practice
of the Nestorians who im-
merse..... 391
- What are, or are not its Greek
equivalents..... 407
- Aquinas and the Mediæval
schoolmen no authorities in
philology..... 31
- Apostacy, the fatal—Of a true
child of God, possible..... 1118
- The Word of God precludes
the bare supposition..... 1132
- Assertion on, that is astounding 154
- Autem* surreptitiously dropped
from, "*in hac autem significa-
tione*,"..... 453
- Authorities—Dr. Ditzler's cita-
tions from not to be depended
on..... 293, 483
- Dr. Graves' presentation of,
inaccurate..... 294
- Baptism—Scripturally admin-
istered only by Baptists..... 20
- Nothing in its meaning to
countenance immersion..... 70
- Importance of a right observ-
ance of. Instituted in language
easy to be understood 15
- "Buried in," interpreted as
signifying immersion by Wes-
ley, and by Conybeare and
Howson, and by Moses Stu-
art..... 77, 113
- No ambiguity in the law of... 142
- Proselyte—in dark ages by
immersion..... 123
- No authority for infant bap-
tism..... 666
- By a single immersion not till
fourth century..... 123
- practice of the Apostles..... 132
- There is a, that incorporates a
man in Christ..... 121
- The rite that unites a man
with the church..... 130
- Of the Holy Spirit occurred
but twice..... 131
- Paul's *one*, not water baptism 144
- Facilities for in Jerusalem..... 178
- Of the Eunuch..... 179
- Calvin and Dodridge on..... 180
- Of Lydia and the Philippian
Jailer..... 181
- Administered to Gentiles as a
condition of participation in
Jewish privileges..... 659
- Administered by Christ and
his Apostles to believers only.. 733
- Citations from ancient Fath-
ers show that in early centu-
ries it was by sprinkling or
pouring..... 247
- Immersion as a mode of, ad-
opted from superstitious mo-
tives... .. 243
- Chrysostom a washing..... 247
- Of John, only on a profession
of repentance..... 717
- Not administered to infants... 718
- Must precede church member-
ship..... 813
- Must precede the observance
of the Supper..... 815
- Validity of, dependent on the
character of the church, not
the administrator..... 845
- Valid, impracticable on Bap-
tist principles..... 867
- A prerequisite to the Lord's
Supper as is shown by eminent
Pedobaptist writers..... 874
- Baptist Churches—Founded in
the same way the Methodist
Churches were..... 945
- Baptists—None are truly bap-
tized..... 42, 835
- Therefore not warranted in
administering the Lord's Sup-
per..... 835
- The early origin of, well at-
tested..... 842
- Not descended from the Mun-
sterites..... 844
- Opposed to the Reformation... 853
- Are bungling philologists..... 51
- Did not derive their baptism
from John Smyth..... 894
- Deal unfairly with their auth-
orities..... 331

- teristic manner grossly misrepresented, Dr. Ditzler..... 883
- A general arraignment of, as
- (1) Perverters of the Bible...
 - (2) Falsifiers of history.....
 - (3) Obstructors of the Reformation..... 886
- The scholarship of the world condemns the 61
- A failure till Methodism came to the rescue..... 869
- Baptized—Translated *sprinkled* in Vatican and Sinait. MSS., and by Euthymius..... 107
- Barnabas—A writer of uncertain date, and of questionable credit..... 454
- Bethany—Not Bethabara, was where John baptized..... 102
- Bible—The translators of King James' version of the..... 46
- How *en* is translated in the 46, 61
- The translators of, defended... 53
- Burial—The only adequate emblem of death..... 76, 116
- Does not imply a covering..... 101
- 125, 199.
- Baptizo*—That it means to immerse, is conceded by all the divines of the Latin and Greek church—The reproach of any discussion about so plain a matter, belongs to *modern* Protestant controversialists exclusively..... 17
- Calvin concedes that it means to immerse..... 19
- Luther makes a like concession..... 20, 175
- Never came to mean dip, until B. C. 165..... 33
- Applied where the water comes over..... 39
- Its Semitic equivalents show it means sprinkle..... 41
- Meaning of, easily determined 44
- Has not diverse significations, and again, on p. 359. 45
- Its primary not its current meaning 49
- brecho* its equivalent..... 50
- The first example of its use occurs in Pindar..... 51
- Examples from other authors exhibiting its classical use..... 52
- Aristotle 54
- Resumé* of argument to prove it never means primarily to immerse..... 55
- Conceded by Baptists that it rarely means immerse..... 70
- Primary meaning of, to sprinkle..... 72
- and again on p. 73, 128.
- This attested by a number of eminent scholars..... 144
- and again, on p. 449.
- This attested by a number to immerse..... 77
- and again, on p. 482.
- Pindar does not use, in sense of *to dip*..... 100
- Not the equivalent of *immergo* 101
- Its meaning in the commission easy to be understood..... 135
- Dr Ditzler's position in regard to, absurd..... 134
- A modal term..... 137
- To obscure this term, is to confuse the obligations of obedience..... 138
- Its equivalents in Syriac 273
- and again, on pp. 152, 197, 146
- Its equivalents as defined by Castell, by Oberleitner and Carafago 147
- Its equivalents in Arabic..... 151
- and again, on p. 198.
- Its equivalents in Chaldee..... 151
- Its equivalents in Hebrew 172, 444
- Cannot have diverse meanings in scripture..... 164
- In Greek literature before Christ occurs 33 times..... 166
- Dean Alford on meaning..... 166
- Its classical meanings..... 171
- Has a great variety of meanings..... 193
- Translated *tingo* by Latin Fathers..... 197
- No example can be adduced in which it means to sprinkle upon 214
- Never occurs in the sense of *to dip* 220
- and again, on p. 453.
- Examples of, cited by Conant examined..... 220
- Beza on..... 224
- As defined by learned authorities..... 226, 483
- Julianus defines *to sprinkle* ... 242
- Tertullian likewise. 242
- Eminent Lexicographers cited as so defining it..... 373
- Curtius derives it from *athos*. 253
- Not interchangeable with *brecho* 257
- Examples of its classic use where immersion is clearly in-

- dicated..... 259
 Figurative uses of, confirma-
 tory of the correctness of Bap-
 tist practice..... 263
 The import of classical exam-
 ples cited..... 268
 Has a Hebrew equivalent
 meaning to purify..... 269
 Examples of, from Greek clas-
 sics mistranslated by Dr. Ditz-
 ler..... 288
 Its root—*bapto* and this only
 rarely means to *dip*..... 299 307
 Reluctant witnesses concede
 it means to immerse always .. 309
 That it means drown in case
 of a living animal proved ab-
 surd..... 318
 Leigh and Schleusner's testi-
 mony in regard to its mean-
 ing falsified by Dr. Ditzler..... 345
 A false presentation of author-
 ities on..... 362
 Its significance in New Testa-
 ment contrasted with its use
 in the classics..... 371
 Its first occurrence in a literal
 sense..... 397
 And *páta*kuzo used in same
 sense by Aristotle 398
 From its Hebrew and Latin
 equivalent shown to signify
 aspersions..... 444
 Tabal, the Hebrew equivalent
 of, shown to mean primarily
sprinkle, moisten..... 445
 The metaphorical sense as-
 cribed to it by Schleusner,
 proves it to mean "to pour
 out"..... 454
 Mode Of—A modern contro-
 versy..... 18
 Unless in regard to an excep-
 tional proceeding in the case
 of "clinics"..... 18
 Indicated by the descent of
 the Holy Ghost..... 91
 Authorities for determining...
 (1) Lexicons. (2) The origin-
 al scriptures. (3) Ancient ver-
 sions of scriptures..... 25
 Illustrated by the force of
 part *e*..... 60
 and by dative of element *in*
which, without a preposition.. 60
 Scripture phrases illustrating
 "Buried by baptism," Rom.
 vi, 4, pp 75, 182
 "Buried in baptism," Col. ii,
 12. nn. 146. 182
 "Planted together in likeness
 of his death"..... 170
 "Buried in," interpreted of
 immersion by Wesley..... 77
 and other eminent Theolo-
 gians, pp. 154, 184.
 "Buried by baptism," Rom.
 vi. 4, pp. 72, 182.
 "Buried by baptism" does
 not refer to water baptism.... 122
 "Buried by baptism," an evi-
 dent allusion to water bap-
 tism 131
 "Buried by baptism," Ewing
 on..... 131
 "Buried by baptism," has no
 reference to proselyte baptism 132
 "Buried by baptism," as ex-
 pounded by Beza, Vossius. 132
 Witsius and Suicer on..... 133
 "Buried by baptism," Cony-
 beare and Howson and Mo-
 ses Stuart on..... 113
 "Born of Water and Spirit,"
 John iii, 5 explained..... 685
 "Buried in baptism," Col. ii,
 12, pp. 146, 182
 Interpreted of, immersion by
 Wesley and other eminent
 Theologians..... 77
 also, on pp. 117, 120, 154, 184.
 "Planted together in the like-
 ness of his death," Rom. vi, 5. 170
 "Baptized for the dead," 1 Cor.
 xv, 29..... 182
 Eminent Methodist divines
 refer it to water baptism..... 184
 "Our bodies washed in pure
 water," refers to Christian
 baptism..... 186
 "In Jordan," *eis ton Jordanen*,
 Mark i, 9..... 114
 "Divers baptisms," a reference
 to immersion for various cere-
 monial pollutions..... 189
 Altig and Kitto on..... 190
 Is immersion only..... 139
 " " " a Philological
 argument in proof..... 142
 Eminent Pedobaptists divines
 affirm..... 155
 Greek classics prove it..... 207
 If by pouring, Christ would
 have said so..... 142
 If immersion then, it is drown-
 ing..... 133
 Early Greek Fathers on..... 229
 Latin Fathers on..... 230
 That immersion is the scrip-
 tural—the practice of Greek

- strongly confirms..... 310
- Historic testimony in regard to..... 416
- Apostolic and post-Apostolic testimony regarding..... 418
- Testimony of Eastern or Greek church historians regarding... 419
- Testimony of Western or Latin Catholic church historians regarding..... 421
- Testimony of Anglican or Episcopal church regarding .. 422
- Testimony of Lutheran church regarding..... 426
- A brief review of debate on pages 501-5.
- Testimony of Presbyterian historians on..... 506
- Testimony of Congregational historians on..... 508
- Testimony of Methodist historians on..... 508
- Testimony of Cyclopedias on..... 510
- Testimony of most eminent Pedobaptists on..... 512
- Conjoint testimony of the Fathers of the Reformation and of Methodism on..... 515
- Concessions of 22 eminent Presbyterian scholars and commentators on..... 517
- Recapitulation of argument on..... 521
- Baptism—Of Christ an immersion..... 58
- and again, on pp. 62, 74.
- Baptism, Proselyte—Unknown for centuries subsequent to the Christian era..... 772
- Had been practiced from days of Moses..... 786
- No Jew, with his children, ever submitted to it..... 801
- Gives no support to infant baptism..... 802
- Baptism, Infant—Indiscriminately administered to all infants by Methodists..... 576
- Held by Methodists to be a means of grace..... 576
- As held by Methodists, admits infants into the church..... 576
- No scriptural authority for..... 576
- The advocates of, can give no living authority for their practice..... 577
- qtdo*—Origen and Hippolytus, both render it by sprinkle, &c. 329
- A philological argument to show it does not mean to dip 333
- Calumny—A gratuitous, resented..... 673
- Camp Meeting.—Round Lake—why held there..... 109
- Canon.—Dr. George Campbell's maintained..... 214, 234, 319, 353
- Examined and rejected..... 324
- Illustrated and vindicated..... 360
- Never sanctioned by scholars 372
- Sustained by the Peshito..... 494
- Carrollton.—The Great Debate. Hist. of .. 8
- Chemistry.—Philological..... 78
- Child—The baptized, will have holy thoughts when it rains... 616
- Children—The little whom Jesus blessed were not baptized..... 735
- Circumcision—What some clear-headed Presbyterians say about its relation to baptism..... 634
- Clark, John—never was dipped 884
- Clemens Alexandrinus—a tale related by, shows him to have regarded baptism as suffusion..... 247
- Commission, Christ's—Last, couched in simple terms..... 136
- Can only be misinterpreted by a perverse ingenuity..... 136
- Terms of, to be literally construed..... 138
- Cannot be misunderstood by the unlearned..... 139
- Is the only law for Christian baptism..... 159
- Utterly ignored by Dr. Ditzler 648
- Dean Alford says, was not couched in figurative or ambiguous terms..... 161
- Not couched in figurative language..... 214
- Does not authorize but forbids infant baptism..... 736
- Authorizes the baptism of infants..... 768
- Conant, Dr.—Vindicated as a scholar and critic..... 236, 261
- Commission did not establish baptism *de novo*..... 849
- Controversy (Religious)—Promotive of the interests of truth..... 5
- Dr. Ralph Wardlaw on..... 5
- Dr. J. Buchanan on..... 5
- Dr. J. Cummin on..... 5
- Creed of the Methodists—to be found not in the "ritual" but in the "articles of religion".... 707
- Critics—Crazy..... 78

- Church—Spirituality of not impaired by an ungoldly membership..... 643
 A Jewish, never existed..... 654
 The, as an "institution" must owe its origin to a law establishing it..... 656
 Consists of all God's people in all time..... 554
 One and identical through all ages 596
 Infants have ever been members of..... 598
 Infants made members of the Jewish by baptism..... 598
 The Jewish was spiritual..... 560
 Had only two ordinances, baptism and the Lord's supper... 641
 The M. E. does not answer to its own definition of a Church 584
 Relation of a local, to the universal or invisible church..... 620
 The oneness of, results from the oneness of the covenant of redemption .. 621
 No traces of it in the families of Isaac or Jacob 654
 Church Identity.—Dr. Ditzler's theory of, subversive of the church's purity..... 631
 Not affected by ritualistic changes..... 641
 Proved not by analogy but facts attesting oneness..... 644
 The principle of, leads to most disastrous results..... 676
 Disowned and rejected by distinguished advocates of infant baptism 676
 A logical refutation of..... 679
 Proved by Christ recognizing and reforming the Jewish 705
 By the Apostles doing the same 707
 Practice of circumcision through the whole apostolic age..... 710
 Disproved by the discriminative character of John's ministry and baptism..... 713, 719
 By the hostility of the Jews to the church of Christ..... 720
 By the fact that adult children have no hereditary claim to baptism under the Gospel..... 720
 Argument for re-affirmed and restated 787
 To deny involves the wildest absurdities 831
 Churches—Baptist.—The true churches of Christ..... 841
 The antiquity of..... 842
 Identified with Wickliffites & Waldenses 843
 A failure till Methodism infused scriptural life into them 886
 Church of Christ.—Only the Jewish institution purified..... 884
 Its origin clearly pointed out.. 797
 Its oneness set forth in the supper 819
 Its oneness, all are baptized into 819
 What constitutes the, can only be learned from the New Testament..... 586
 By confounding the, with the "invisible" church, Dr. Ditzler shirks the issue in debate... 649
 An indefensible hypothesis regarding 591
 Identified with the good olive tree..... 594
 The ordinances and laws of, can have no appositeness to that aggregation Dr Ditzler identifies with Christ's church 605
 No traces of it under former dispensations..... 609
 No traces of it in the family of Abraham..... 630
 Covenants.—The two represented by Hagar and Sarah..... 624
 Dr. Ditzler's reluctance to abide by concessions made in regard to..... 771
 Of Grace, not made with man..... 668
 With Abraham distinct from covenant of grace..... 670
 Debate—Baptists of Carrollton challenged to, by Methodists of that city..... 11
 This, but the continuation of an ancient conflict... 12
 Dip—Greek terms for..... 171
 "Discipline"—The Methodist, in conflict with Dr Ditzler's theory of infant purity.. 606
 A false construction put upon. 766
 Discretion—None permitted to man in matters involving obedience to Christ..... 12
 Discussion, (oral)—The chief mode of advancing knowledge known to the ancients..... 5
 An important means of advancing religious truth..... 6
 Value of, exemplified in the life and writings of Paul..... 7

- bonatists—They were the first
 professed Christians that in-
 voked the civil arm in behalf
 of religion..... 853
 Briser, Prof. H.—A letter from,
 giving history of Amer. Ed.
 of Liddell & Scott's Lexicon.. 494
Ekklesia—The Greek, may serve
 to elucidate the character of
 a Church of Christ..... 586
 The term must be interpreted
 by its Jewish, not its classic
 import..... 646
 Enoch—Why John baptized
 there..... 69, 100
 Ephraim—Cyrus 465
 Essence—Not independent of
 form, where a specific act is
 commanded to be done—white
 pine and Gopher wood..... 19
 Eunuch—The confession of, a
 forgery..... 682
 Evidence—When most valuable
 113
 Fathers—They use *tingo* for bap-
 tism generally, without indi-
 cating mode..... 405
 Faith—A vicarious, may qualify
 for baptism..... 763
 Graves, Dr.—in a new *role* as a
 defender of the Discipline..... 807
 Greek Church—Repudiated the
 baptism of the Latin or Ro-
 mish church, and practice on-
 ly immersion..... 18, 310, 312, 344
 Does not invariably immerse 326
 Its degeneracy destroys an
 argument based on its prac-
 tice..... 326
 Greek Language—Understood
 by Christ and his Apostles... 189
 also, on p. 384.
 Is understood by the Greeks 320
 The true meaning of an exam-
 ple in the, contested..... 341
 Of the New Testament, differ-
 ent from that of the classic
 authors..... 371
 Greek prepositions in dispute—
eis, 67, 86, 89, 91, 95, 99, 100,
 284, 340.
ek 67, 90
epi..... 67, 90, 91
apo..... 90, 169, 284
en..... 90, 91, 99, 127, 290
 “ primary meaning of *in*... 340
 “ Harvey, Rev. James, on... 94
 “ governing date of instru-
 ment..... 339
 Greek Syntax—A principle of,
 of vital importance in deter-
 mining the meaning of *bap-
 tizo*..... 290
 Hawks—Or owls, all one to Dr.
 Ditzler 901
 Hermas—A dreamer..... 455
Hic, hæc, hoc, in dispute..... 453
 “ “ “ a quaternity of
 Methodist scholars stand ready
 to avouch the orthodoxy of
 this pronominal trinity..... 451
 Historians and critics to be test-
 ed by their original authori-
 ties..... 534
 Households—hard to find
 eight average, without an in-
 fant in one or more..... 765
 “Immerse?”—Defined by Web-
 ster..... 162
 Immersion on—The one..... 182
 “ “ no authority
 for as baptism..... 330
 Infants—Not born free from the
 taint of original sin..... 606
 Morally qualified for church
 membership..... 639
 The right of, to baptism and
 church privileges fully estab-
 lished..... 743
 None in the church at Rome.. 759
 “ “ “ “ Corinth 759
 None in all the churches of
 Galatia..... 761
 None in the church at Colosse 775
 None in the churches ad-
 dressed in Epistle to Hebrews 775
 None in the churches ad-
 dressed in two Epistles of
 Peter..... 777
 Interpretation—Rules of, 21, 22, 23
 “ “ Blackstone on 140
 John, (Baptist)—Places of his
 baptism determine nothing as
 to its mode..... 82
 Are conclusive as to the act
 performed. 96
 Pedobaptist testimony on this
 point..... 96
 Mentions three baptisms..... 97
 His preaching was of a low or-
 der..... 683
 His occupation such as Apost-
 les would not come down to.. 683
 Baptized only unto a *pros-
 pective* repentance..... 683
 Baptized a scurvey set of ig-
 norant candidates..... 683
 Merely cleared away the
 brush..... 683
 Language—Baptists hold that
 use is the sole arbiter of..... 32

- Law of the interpretation of. 137, 252.
- Lexicon—Merits of Liddell & Scott's, canvassed. 402, 494
- Citations from Stokius' showing that "to dip," "to immerse," is the literal meaning of *baptizo*. 413
- Lexicographers, Greek—Twenty-seven of the most distinguished enumerated. 27
- Not scientific in their method 33
- Six eminent ones on *baptizo* Dr. Graves' favorite, do not sustain him. 200
- Lexicons—Prof. Toy cited on value of. 280
- Definitions of *baptizo* by more than thirty of the most renowned. 281
- All sustain Dr. Ditzler, and are against Dr. Graves. 468
- A reaffirmation of how they define *baptizo*. 296
- The testimony of all, in favor of immersion as baptism. 308
- Previous renderings of their definitions vindicated. 312
- That of Liddell & Scott, has an instructive and significant history. 316
- Forty standard Greek, define *baptizo* by "to immerse," or "to dip," as its primary meaning. 320
- Liddell & Scott's, a "school-boy" affair, and of little account. 332
- All made by immersionists from the revival of Greek learning in the West to this day. 336
- Of N. T. Greek, by eminent scholars define *baptizo* by to "immerse, dip," &c. 351
- Preponderance of their authority in favor of sprinkling. 395
- Lord's Supper—The, a Mosaic institution. 640
- To be observed in the churches of Christ. 809
- Cannot precede baptism. 811, 815
- Impossible conditions for partaking of, imposed by Dr. Graves. 823
- A modification of the Paschal feast. 830
- Baptism not a prerequisite to 832
- Distinct from the Paschal feast 846
- Not properly restricted to those in the Church. 850
- Regeneration a qualification for. 857
- Each local church the guardian of. 859, 862
- Its purity carefully guarded by the Apostolic churches. 864
- A converting ordinance according to the Methodist scheme 865
- Has no pre-eminence in sanctity over other commands of Christ. 869
- Methodists.—The first people to teach the salvation of infants. 663
- Munsterites—Were sprinklers. 890
- New Testament.—Syriac, yields no countenance to sprinkling or pouring as a mode of baptism. 392
- Open Communionists.—The most eminent Baptists have been. 871
- Passover.—Who should be invited to, a matter of prescription 861
- A family, not a national ordinance. 860
- Patience—of the people—A singular mode of testing it. 14
- Planting—Does not always imply covering over. 125
- Peace.—As against Baptist aggression, Methodists intend to conquer one. 885
- Pedo-baptism—Involves the absurdity of two baptisms. 635
- Peshito.—The Syriac written in the vernacular of Christ and his apostles. 145
- Clearly teaches that aspersion is baptism. 202
- A transcript of Christ's utterances. 240
- An indispensable interpreter of the Greek N. T. 240
- Philological Tested.—Dr Ditzler's tested. 57-8, 256
- Theories. 79
- Puerilities exposed. 192
- Dr. Graves tested. 193, 341
- Facts collated and held to sustain affusion as a mode of baptism. 399
- Philologists.—The old school not scientific. 224
- "Sustain sprinkle". 224
- A quaternity of, ready to pledge *hic, hæc, hoc* in the interest of Methodist orthodoxy 452
- Philology.—Erroneous, Hebrew exposed. 263

A superficial exposed	298	Means "wash"	460
Empirical and scientific con-		Never translated by <i>baptizo</i>	461
trasted	227	The literal meaning of "to	
Hebrew, as represented by		dip," "to immerse"	487
Maimonides and Gesenius, fa-		Terms—Primary meaning of	
vor sprinkling as the mode of		what	266, 256
baptism	88	Tertullian—His Latin equiva-	
The "new-born" excepted		lents for <i>baptizo</i>	497
against	233	Misinterpreted by Dr. Graves	455
Two grand discoveries in,		Testimony—That of Barnabas	
made contemporaneously by		and Hermas trustworthy	485
Faust in Germany and Ditz-		Theocracy—The history of the	
ler in America	447	Jewish, epitomized	674
All in favor of Dr. Ditzler and		The Jewish, not a Christian	
adverse to Dr. Graves	471	church	675
rifications.—Ceremonial,		<i>Tingo</i> —Used by the Fathers as	
when expressed by <i>taval</i> al-		a generic term for baptism	405
ways by immersion	113	Used by the Latin Fathers in	
Maimonides on	113	a modal sense, and expressive	
Never by immersion	127	of dipping	429, 437
By washing	173	The Fathers and the lexicons	
nts—Old Testament, unwor-		show it to be used in the sense	
thily disparaged by Dr.		of aspersion	438
Graves	664	Fort, Dr. Ditzler's yields to	
otagint, The—Its value in		the first shot	474
determining the meaning of		Translators—Of King James'	
Greek terms	380	version of the Scriptures, im-	
Scriptures No example in an-		mersionists	64
cient versions of where <i>baptizo</i>		Transubstantiation—Matched	
s rendered by sprinkle or		in the perversion of the Lord's	
pour	320	Supper by Methodists	865
Oriental versions of, sustain		Truth—Advanced by discussion	5
"to dip," "to immerse," as the		Tyndale—An immersionist	63
meaning of <i>baptizo</i>	474	Water Running—A necessity to	
Siloam not a washing pool	464	a Jewish multitude	109
Value of ancient versions of,		Plenty of, necessary for John	112
in determining the meaning		Plenty of, necessary for camp	
of the originals	145, 377	meetings	109, 116
"sprinkle,"—Defined by Web-		A symbol of purity and of the	
ster	162	outpouring of the Spirit	616
Sprinkle or pour a man im-		Wall—In History of Inf. Bap-	
possible	163	seeks to conciliate Baptists for	
Scriptures—Of the Old Testa-		sinister purposes	500
ment, two versions of, in		Wesley—A spurious edition of	
Greek made early in Christian		his "Notes on the Gospel" put	
era invariably translate <i>taval</i>		in circulation	486
by <i>bapto</i> or <i>baptidzo</i>	383	"Wesley's Tract" not written	
cession—Baptist, a myth	827, 868	by Wesley	663
Invalidated by notorious facts		Has the <i>imprimatur</i> of the	
Logismuss—Dr. Graves' not con-		Methodist Book concern	672
clusive	617	Wheel Church—The, has no	
riac Tongue—The vernacular		counterpart in the New Testa-	
of Christ and contemporary		ment	992
Jews	240, 462	Williams, Roger—Never was a	
Greater part of New Testam-		Baptist	845
ent written in, according to		Words—Primary meaning of	
Pres. Stiles of Yale College	240	287.	
<i>bat</i> —In Hebrew, is translated		Zion, Mount—As opposed to	
by <i>bapto</i> , yet never means		Mount Sinai in Heb. xii, re-	
immerse	327, 458	fers to the gospel church, 625, 630	

